SUPREME COURT, U. S.
FILED
SEP 25 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

No. 75-474

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL L. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN W. LUNDING JR. and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Petitioners,*

vs.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*Respondents.*

## PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM J. SCOTT,
Attorney General of Illinois,
160 North LaSalle,
Chicago, Illinois,

*Attorney for Petitioners.*

HERBERT LEE CAPLAN,
Assistant Attorney General,
312/793-3587
*Of Counsel.*

## INDEX


PAGE

Opinion Below ..... 2

Jurisdiction ..... 2

Questions Presented ..... 2

Statute Involved ..... 3

Statement of the Case ..... 6

Reasons for Granting the Writ ..... 8

The decision below is unsupported by evidence in the record and misconstrues the reach of Supreme Court Decisions.

The decision below involves important questions of federal law which have not been but should be decided by this Court.

Conclusion ..... 20

Certificate of Service ..... 22

Appendix:

A. Opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals A1

B. Opinion and Order of the District Court ..... B1

C. Opinion of Earlier Related Three Judge Court.. C1

D. Summary of Vote in November 5, 1974 General Election ..... D1

E. Summary of Vote in November 7, 1972 General Election ..... E1


## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES


CASES:

*Abate* v. *Mundt*, 403 U.S. 183, 186, 91 S. Ct. 1904, 1907 (1971) ..... 13

*American Party of Texas* v. *White*, 415 U.S. 767, 781-782, 94 S. Ct. 1296, 1306 (1974) ..... 13

*Baird* v. *Davoren*, 346 F. Supp. 515 (Mass. 1972) .... 11

See *Buckley* v. *Valeo*, —— Fed. 2nd ——, (D.C.C. 1975), 44 LW 2105 ..... 18

*Carroll* v. *President and Commissioners of Princess Anne*, 393 U.S. 175, 178-179, 89 S. Ct. 347, 350, 351 (1968) ..... 12

*Communist Party* v. *Austin*, 362 F. Supp. 27, 30 (E.D. Mich. 1973) ..... 13

*Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie*, 357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972) ..... 11

*Dusch* v. *Davis*, 387 U.S. 112, 117, 87 S. Ct. 1554, 1556 (1967) ..... 16

*Gaffney* v. *Cummins*, 412 U.S. 735, 93 S. Ct. 2321, 2325, 2329, 2331 (1973) ..... 13

*Jenness* v. *Fortson*, 403 U.S. 431, 442, 91 S. Ct. 1970, 1976 (1970) ..... 18

*MacDougall* v. *Green*, 80 F. Supp. 725, aff'd. 335 U.S. 281, 285, 286, 69 S. Ct. 1 (1948) ..... 9

*Moore* v. *Ogilvie*, 293 F. Supp. 411, 394 U.S. 814, 89 S. Ct. 1493 (1969) ..... 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 20

*Reynolds* v. *Sims*, 300 U.S. 533, 578, 84 S. Ct. 1362, 1390 (1964) ..... 13

*Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes*, 318 F. Supp. 1262, 1269 (S.D. Ohio 1970), app. dis. 406 U.S. 583, 588, 92 S. Ct. 1716, 1719 (1972) ..... 11, 14

*Socialist Workers Party* v. *Hare*, 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969) ..... 11

*Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller*, 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y. 1970) .....11, 17

*Southern Pacific Terminal Co.* v. *I.C.C.*, 219 U.S. 498, 515, 31 S. Ct. 279, 283 (1911) ..... 12

*Storer* v. *Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730-731, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 1279, 1282 (1974) ..... 12, 17

*U.S.* v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 345 U.S. 629, 632-633, 73 S. Ct. 894, 897-898 (1953) ..... 12

*Zautra* v. *Miller*, 384 F. Supp. 847, 850 (D. Utah, 1972) 18

STATUTES:

Federal

Title 26, U.S.C. § 9033 (b) (3) ..... 18

State

Ill. Rev. Stat. 1957, Chap. 46, 10-2 ..... 9

Ill. Rev. Stat. 1973, Chap. 46, § 10-2 ...3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

---

**No.**

---

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL L. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN W. LUNDING JR. and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Petitioners,*

vs.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*Respondents.*

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT**

---

## PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

The State Board of Elections for the State of Illinois, and Michael E. Lavelle, Donald W. Adams, Franklin J. Lunding, Jr. and William L. Harris, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections, respectfully pray that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit entered on June 27, 1975.

## OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals is reported at 518 F. 2d 517 and is included herein as Appendix A. The opinion and order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, is not reported and is included herein as Appendix B. An earlier related interlocutory opinion is reported at 357 F. Supp. 105 and is included herein as Appendix C.

## JURISDICTION

The judgment and opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was entered on June 27, 1975. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

## QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a State may require a new political party seeking statewide ballot position to organize in more than one concentrated geographical area.

## STATUTE INVOLVED

Illinois Election Code, Section 10-2;

Ill. Rev. Stats. 1973, Chap. 46, § 10-2.

"...

A political party which, at the last general election for State and county officers, polled for its candidate for Governor more than 5% of the entire vote cast for Governor, is hereby declared to be an "established political party" as to the State and as to any district or political subdivision thereof.

A political party which, at the last election in any congressional district, legislative district, county, township, school district, park district, municipality or other district or political subdivision of the State, polled more than 5% of the entire vote cast within such congressional district, legislative district, county, township, school district, park district, municipality, or political subdivision of the State, where such district, political subdivision or municipality, as the case may be, has voted as a unit for the election of officers to serve the respective territorial area of such district, political subdivision or municipality, is hereby declared to be an "established political party" within the meaning of this Article as to such district, political subdivision or municipality.

Any group of persons hereafter desiring to form a new political party throughout the State, or in any political subdivision greater than a county and less than the State, shall file with the State Board of Elections a petition, as hereinafter provided; and any such group of persons hereafter desiring to form a new political party, in any county shall file such petition with the county clerk; and any such group of persons hereafter desiring to form a new political party in any municipality or district less than a county shall file

such petition with the clerk or Board of Election Commissioners of such municipality or district, as the case may be. Any such petition for the formation of a new political party throughout the State, or in any such district or political subdivision, as the case may be, shall declare as concisely as may be the intention of the signers thereof to form such new political party in the State, or in such district or political subdivision; shall state in not more than 5 words the name of such new political party; shall contain a complete list of candidates of such party for all offices to be filled in the State, or such district or political subdivision as the case may be, at the next ensuing election then to be held; and, if such new political party shall be formed for the entire State, shall be signed by not less than 25,000 qualified voters: Provided, that no more than 13,000 signatures from the same county may be counted toward the required total of 25,000 signatures. If such new political party shall be formed for any district or political subdivision less than the entire State, such petition shall be signed by qualified voters equaling in number not less than 5% of the number of voters who voted at the next preceding general election in such district or political subdivision in which such district or political subdivision voted as a unit for the election of officers to serve its respective territorial area.

The filing of such petition shall constitute the political group a new political party, for the purpose only of placing upon the ballot at such ensuing election such list of party candidates for offices to be voted for throughout the State, or for offices to be voted for in such district or political subdivision less than the State, as the case may be, under the name of and as the candidates of such new political party.

If, at such ensuing election, the new political party's candidate for Governor shall receive more than 5% of the entire votes cast for Governor, then such new political party shall become an "established political party" as to the State and as to every district or poli-

tical subdivision thereof. If, at such ensuing election, the other candidates of the new political party, or any other candidate or candidates of the new political party shall receive more than 5% of all the votes cast for the office or offices for which they were candidates at such election, in the State, or in any district or political subdivision of the State, as the case may be, then and in that event, such new political party shall become an "established political party" within the State or within such district or political subdivision less than the State, as the case may be, in which such candidate or candidates received more than 5% of the votes cast for the office or offices for which they were candidates. It shall thereafter nominate its candidates for public offices to be filled in the State, or such district or political subdivision of the State, as the case may be, under the provisions of the laws regulating the nomination of candidates of established political parties at primary elections and political party conventions, as now or hereafter in force.

A political party which continues to receive for its candidate for Governor more than 5% of the entire vote cast for Governor, shall remain an "established political party" as to the State and as to every district or political subdivision thereof. But if the political party's candidate for Governor fails to receive more than 5% of the entire vote cast for Governor, or if the political party does not nominate a candidate for Governor, the political party shall remain an "established political party" within the State or within such district or political subdivision less than the State, as the case may be, only so long as, and only in those districts or political subdivisions in which, the candidates of that political party, or any candidate or candidates of that political party, continue to receive more than 5% of all the votes cast for the office or offices for which they were candidates at succeeding general elections within the State or within any district or political subdivision of the State, as the case may be."

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Communist Party of Illinois is an unincorporated voluntary association having its principal office in Chicago, Illinois. The Party, and its designated candidates for statewide office, sought recognition as a new statewide political party, and ballot position in the November 5, 1974 general election, pursuant to Section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stats. 1973, Chap. 46, § 10-2.

Although the candidates of the Communist Party of Illinois have appeared on the statewide ballot in prior elections, they have always failed to receive 5% of the votes cast in those elections, and thus do not qualify as an established political party. (See Appendix D and E)

The Illinois Election Code requires a petition for the formation of a new political party throughout the State to contain not less than 25,000 signatures, provided that no more than 13,000 may be counted from one county.

Respondents submitted petitions containing 23,000 signatures from Cook County. Objections were filed to the sufficiency of the nominating petitions, which objections were sustained by the State Board of Elections.

Thereafter, Respondents brought suit in the District Court to declare the Illinois signature distribution provisions of § 10-2 unconstitutional and to enjoin its enforcement. Jurisdiction was alleged under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3), 1343(4), 2201, 2202 and the First, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

A motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was presented. The trial judge declined to convene a three judge court and entered a preliminary mandatory injunction declaring Section 10-2 of the Illinois

Election Code violative of the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment, and directing the Illinois State Board of Elections to certify the names of the Communist Party candidates for the November 5, 1974 Illinois General Election. (Appendix B) On appeal of this order, the Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The District Court ruled that the Illinois "signature distribution requirement constitutes an arbitrary formula which grants one group greater voting strength than another and discriminates against voters of the most populous county of the State in favor of less populous counties."

The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed, holding that the "county distribution requirement of section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, like its predecessor, 'lacks the equality to which the exercise of political rights is entitled under the Fourteenth Amendment.'"

This conclusion is based upon an overstatement of the reach of prior Supreme Court decisions, and a failure to perceive the real impact of the election law upon voters in Illinois.

The issue is not "one man-one vote" but whether any proposed new statewide political party is a serious one and has risen to the dignity of a statewide ballot position. There is no signature distribution restriction upon ballot position for countywide office. Discussion of statewide candidates and issues is impaired, and the public interest disserved, however, by enabling a flooding of the statewide ballot with local fringe candidates whose election activities and support is limited to a single county enclave. The Election Code, Chap. 46, § 10-2, based on historical experience, serves to screen out the frivolous and nuisance candidacies, and to encourage and promote serious statewide political party activity.

The present signature distribution requirement of the Illinois Election Code must be understood in the context of the litigation which preceded its enactment, and the realities of Illinois politics.

The State is organized into 102 counties. Of these, Cook County is uniquely the most urbanized county, containing approximately 50% of the total State population. The remaining 101 counties, typically referred to as "Downstate", contain the remaining 50% of the population.

Prior to *Moore* v. *Ogilvie*, 394 U.S. 814 (1969), Section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stats. 1957, Chap. 46, § 10-2, required a new statewide political party to obtain at least 200 qualified voters' signatures from each of at least 50 counties, to qualify for a place upon the ballot.

An original challenge to this provision, on Fourteenth Amendment constitutional grounds, was rejected by a three-judge court in *MacDougall* v. *Green*, 80 F. Supp. 725, affirmed 335 U.S. 281, 285, 286, 69 S. Ct. 1 (1948). In *MacDougall* the U.S. Supreme Court observed:

> "The appellants' claim to equitable relief against this ruling is based upon the peculiar distribution of population among Illinois' 102 counties.
>
> • • •
>
> *It is clear that the requirement of two hundred signatures from at least fifty counties gives to the voters of the least populous counties of Illinois the power completely to block the nomination of candidates whose support is confined to geographically limited areas.*
>
> • • •
>
> It is allowable State policy to require that candidates for Statewide office should have support not limited to a concentrated locality.
>
> • • •
>
> It would be strange indeed, and doctrinaire for this court, applying such broad constitutional concepts as

> due process and equal protection of the laws, to deny a State the power to *assure a proper diffusion of political initiative as between its thinly populated counties and those having concentrated masses, in view of the fact that latter have practical opportunities for exerting their political weight at the polls not available to the former.* The Constitution—a practical instrument of government—makes no such demands on the States . . ." (Emphasis added)

Twenty-one years later, in *Moore* v. *Ogilvie,* 293 F. Supp. 411, reversed 394 U.S. 814, 89 S. Ct. 1493 (1969), the U.S. Supreme Court restated the issue:

> "It is no answer to the argument under the Equal Protection Clause that this law was designed to require statewide support for launching a new political party rather than support from a few localities. *This law applies a rigid, arbitrary formula to sparsely settled counties and populous counties alike. . . .*" (Emphasis added)

Two justices dissented in the *Moore* case, saying:

> "The Court held in *MacDougall* v. *Green,* 335 U.S. 281, in sustaining the very statutory requirement here at issue that Illinois had pursued an 'allowable state policy [of] require[ing] that candidates for statewide office should have support not limited to a concentrated locality.' Id. at 283. That conclusion seems to me to be no less sound today than it was at the time of the *MacDougall* decision."

Significantly, the majority in the *Moore* case did not say that all signature distribution requirement per se are unconstitutional. To the contrary, the Court recognized that nominating petitions are an "integral part of the state elective system," and that limitations may be imposed if they can "pass muster against charges of discrimination or of abridgement of the right to vote." The majority opinion

noted that "we have said enough to indicate why *MacDougall* v. *Green* is out of line with our recent apportionment cases." 394 U.S. 814 at p. 818.

Thereafter, similar "rigid, arbitrary formula" of other States were also struck down: *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller,* 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y., 1970), New York statute requiring at least 50 signatures from each county of the State; *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes,* 318 F. Supp. 1262 (S.D. Ohio, 1970), an Ohio statute requiring 200 signatures from at least 30 counties; *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Hare,* 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969), a Michigan statute requiring 100 signatures from at least 10 counties; *Baird* v. *Davoren,* 346 F. Supp. 515 (Mass. 1972), a Massachusetts statute requiring signatures from at least three counties.

In response to the *Moore case,* and its progeny, the Illinois General Assembly redrafted the signature provision of the Election Code to eliminate the "rigid, arbitrary formula applicable to sparsely settled counties and populous counties alike", and enacted the present § 10-2:

> "... And, if such new political party shall be formed for the entire state, shall be signed by not less than 25,000 qualified voters: Provided, that no more than 13,000 signatures from the same county may be counted toward the required total of 25,000 signatures."

*Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie,* 357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972) (Appendix C) involves the amended § 10-2, but, unlike the other cases cited by the court below, it was an unappealed interlocutory order. The court majority addressed itself primarily to the loyalty oath issue and recited, in one brief paragraph on the signature distribution requirement, a conclusion to support issuance of a preliminary injuction. No all-inclusive class was established, and the named

Plaintiffs immediately thereafter appeared on the ballot and lost the election. (Appendix E) The issue becoming moot, Plaintiffs failed to ever prosecute their lawsuit to final judgment.

Now, the same tactical situation has reoccurred and the constitutional question has again become one "capable of repetition but evading review." *Southern Pacific Terminal Co.* v. *I.C.C.*, 219 U.S. 498, 515, 31 S Ct. 279, 283 (1911); *Moore* v. *Ogilvie*, 394 U.S 814, 816, 89 S. Ct. 1493, 1494 (1969); *Carroll* v. *President and Commissioners of Princess Anne*, 393 U.S. 175, 178-179, 89 S. Ct. 347, 350, 351 (1968); *United States* v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 345 U.S. 629, 632-633, 73 S Ct. 894, 897-898 (1953).

In the instant action, the trial court could see no difference between the earlier "rigid, arbitrary formula" cases and the current Illinois situation. This superficial "knee-jerk" response is neither compelling in legal analysis, nor in accord with current pragmatic Supreme Court tests of election laws.

As Mr. Justice White most recently said in *Storer* v. *Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730-731, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 1279, 1282 (1974):

> "It has never been suggested that the *Williams-Kramer-Dunn rule* automatically invalidates every substantial restriction on the right to vote or to associate . . . as a practical matter, there must be a substantial regulation of elections . . . if some sort of order, rather than chaos, is to accompany the democratic processes. . . . Decisions in this context, as in others, is very much a 'matter of degree,' Dunn v. Blumstein, supra, 405 U.S., at 348, 92 S. Ct., at 1066, very much a matter of 'consider[ing] the facts and circumstances behind the law, the interests which the State claims to be protecting, and the interests of those who are disadvantaged by the classification.' Williams v. Rhodes, supra, 393

> U.S., at 30, 89 S. Ct. at 10; Dunn v. Blumstein, supra, 405 U.S., at 335, 92 S. Ct. at 999. What the result of this process will be in any specific case may be very difficult to predict with great assurance."

In *Communist Party* v. *Austin,* 362 F. Supp. 27, 30 (E.D. Mich. 1973), the court noted that "[a] state is not required to devise a statutory scheme for access to the ballot that provides perfect equality under all contingencies, at all times."

Rather, "particular circumstances and needs . . . may sometimes justify departures from strict equality." *Abate* v. *Mundt,* 403 U.S. 183, 186, 91 S. Ct. 1904, 1907 (1971); *Reynolds* v. *Sims,* 300 U.S. 533, 578, 84 S. Ct. 1362, 1390 (1964).

In *American Party of Texas* v. *White,* 415 U.S. 767, 781-782, 94 S. Ct. 1296, 1306 (1974), the Supreme Court said:

> "If claiming an equal protection violation, the Appellants' burden was to demonstrate in the first instance a *discrimination against them of some substance.* Statutes create many classifications which do not deny equal protection; *it is only 'invidious discrimination' which offends the constitution."* (Emphasis added)

The court said in *Gaffney* v. *Cummins,* 412 U.S. 735, 93 S. Ct. 2321, 2325, 2329, 2331 (1973):

> "We think that appellees' showing of numerical deviations from population equality among the Senate and House districts in this case failed to make out a prima facie violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment . . .
>
> * * *
>
> Fair and effective representation may be destroyed by gross population variations among districts, but it is apparent that such representation does not depend

> solely on mathematical equality among district populations. There are other relevant factors to be taken into account and other important interests that States may legitimately be mindful of [Citations omitted]
>
> * * *
>
> We are quite unconvinced that the reapportionment plan . . . violated the Fourteenth Amendment because it attempted to reflect the relative strength of the parties in locating and defining election districts. It would be idle, we think, to contend that any political consideration taken into account in fashioning a reapportionment plan is sufficient to invalidate it."

In the case at bar, the trial court did not conduct an evidentiary hearing on the factual allegations of discrimination, or undertake to actually consider, balance and weigh the conflicting public and private interests involved. Most importantly, the trial court made no effort to verify the impact of the "Chicago-Downstate" configuration upon statewide political party activity.

Respondents failed to adduce evidence that Chapter 46, § 10-2 is unreasonable and has a "real and appreciable impact on the exercise of the franchise." There is not a scintilla of evidence in the record that the signature distribution requirement has prevented a legitimate, new statewide political party from obtaining ballot position, nor has there been a showing in any way that voters in the "less populous counties" have thus been given "greater voting strength" than voters in the "most populous county."

Before reaching its conclusion in *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes*, 318 F. Supp. 1262, 1269 (S.D. Ohio 1970), the trial court first determined that:

> "The changes in Ohio election laws effectuated in the 1948-1952 period dramatically, and adversely, affected the rights of individuals to associate for the

> advancement of political beliefs. They also deprived qualified voters of the right to effectively cast their ballots for candidates other than those running as Democrats or Republicans. From 1952 to date there was not one independent or third party candidate on the Ohio ballot running for a state office.
>
> It is thus clear from the history of Ohio's election laws that since 1952 they have effectively precluded persons in Ohio from exercising their rights to political association outside the Democratic and Republican parties. To justify such a restriction on an important, constitutionally guaranteed right, the state must show a compelling state interest. It has not done so. Everything that has happened in the Ohio electoral process since 1952 suggests that no compelling state interest justifies the perpetration of the present statutory entanglement."

The United States Supreme Court, in dismissing the appeal, 406 U.S. 583, 588, 92 S. Ct. 1716, 1719 (1972) found that "all issues litigated below have become moot except for one" and as to that issue, said:

> "The long and the short of the matter is that we know very little more about the operation of the Ohio affidavit procedure as a result of this lawsuit than we would if a prospective plaintiff who had never set foot in Ohio had simply picked this section of the Ohio election laws out of the statute books and filed a complaint in the District Court setting forth the allegedly offending provisions and requesting an injunction against their enforcement. These plaintiffs may well meet the technical requirement of standing, and they may be parties to a case or controversy, but their case has not given any particularity to the effect on them of Ohio's affidavit requirement."

In the case at bar, the only evidence existing at all is spread in the public records of the election returns (see Appendix D and E) showing consistent failure of Respond-

ents to muster even token statewide support of their party, or to garner a vote total equalling the purported signatures on their nominating petitions (not even in the most populous county).

Respondents state that "of 6,040,627 registered Illinois voters, 2,748,969—45% reside in Cook County." The Election Code, in effect, limits a statewide party from using nominating signatures from the most populous county, i.e. Cook, in excess of 52%, or 6-½% over the population spread.

Thus, a serious statewide political party may utilize localized support, but to obtain statewide ballot position, it is also required to organize itself outside a concentrated local area (and no area is more concentrated that the "Chicago" area).

In electoral politics, it has been the vote effectiveness of downstate voters which is diluted by the demographic realities. Without some regulation, Chicago fringe candidates would have the power to flood the statewide ballot in every election.

Balancing this inequality is the object of the signature distribution requirements of § 10-2. It should be noted that this is the converse of the situation in *Moore* v. *Ogilvie*. Here, it is the defeat of § 10-2 which will operate to further augment "Chicago" voting power at the expense of "downstate" voters, and defeat "one-man-one vote" principles as they come into play in real politics. In practice, Section 10-2 creates "no invidious discrimination which offends the constitution."

As Mr. Justice Douglas recognized in *Dusch* v. *Davis*, 387 U.S. 112, 117, 87 S. Ct. 1554, 1556 (1967).

> "The Seven-Four Plan seems to reflect a detente between urban and rural communities that may be important in resolving the complex problems of the

modern megalopolis in relation to the city, the suburbia and the rural countryside.

The court in *Storer* v. *Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730-731, 94 S. Ct. 1282, notes that in regulating the election process the States are not required to use "ineffectual means" to achieve its aims:

> "To conclude otherwise might sacrifice the political stability of the system of the State, *with profound consequence for the entire citizenry, merely in the interest of particular candidates and their supporters having instantaneous access to the ballot.*" (Emphasis added).

*Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller*, 314 F. Supp. 984 (1970), cited by the trial court, says of the power of States to regulate ballot access:

> "Of course, *the State is not powerless to fix reasonable standards or requirements for a position on the ballot so that multifarious political associations with little or no popular support do not bemuse the electoral process.*" (Emphasis added)

In *Storer* v. *Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730-731, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 1280 (1974), the court goes on to say:

> "Other variables must be considered where qualifications for candidates rather than for voters are at issue.
>
> * * *
>
> Subsequently, in *Bullock* v. *Carter*, 405 U.S. 134, 145, 92 S. Ct. 849, 31 L. Ed. 2d 92 (1972), a unanimous Court said:
>
> 'The Court has recognized that a State has a legitimate interest in regulating the number of candidates on the ballot. Jenness v. Fortson, 403 U.S. at 442, 91 S. Ct. at 1976; Williams v. Rhodes, 393 U.S. at 32, 89 S. Ct. 5 at 11. *In so doing, the State understandably and prop-*

> *erly seeks to prevent the clogging of its election machinery, avoid voter confusion, and assure that the winner is the choice of a majority, or at least a strong plurality, of those voting, without the expense and burden of runoff elections. . . .* Moreover, *a State has an interest, if not a duty, to protect the integrity of its political processes from frivolous or fraudulent candidacies.* Jenness v. Fortson, 403 U.S. at 142, 91 S. Ct. at 1976.
>
> Against this pattern of decision, we have no hesitation in sustaining § 6830(d)." (Emphasis added)

In *Jenness* v. *Fortson,* 403 U.S. at 431, 91 S. Ct. at 1976, the Court also states:

> "The fact is that there are obvious differences in kind between the needs and potentials of a political party with historically established broad support, on the one hand, and a new or small political organization on the other. . . . Sometimes the grossest discrimination can lie in treating things that are different as though they were exactly alike. . . ."

The very principle of distribution rejected by the trial court and the circuit court in the case at bar has been made an essential qualifying condition in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974, P.L. 93-443, Chap. 26, U.S.C. § 9033 (b) (3), which requires a candidate to receive:

> ". . . matching contributions which in the aggregate, exceed $5.000 in contributions *from residents of each of at least 20 states . . .*" (Emphasis added)

See *Buckley* v. *Valeo,* —— Fed. 2nd ——, (D.C.C. 1975), 44 LW 2105.

The objectives of Illinois election law and procedure is very similar to that discussed in *Zautra* v. *Miller,* 348 F. Supp. 847, 850 (D. Utah, 1972):

"The question before this court is whether the Fourteenth Amendment mandates the elimination of even minimal geographical burdens of conceivably discriminatory effect upon the formation of political parties.

* * *

New political parties have been successfully formed in Utah through compliance with the law.

* * *

Plaintiffs have supplied no indication that the Utah law has any real, or appreciable, discriminatory effect upon the franchise in Utah.

Utah law contemplates the establishment of political parties with detailed, statewide organizations. During the first year of operations, the law questioned by plaintiffs contemplates the holding of conventions in at least the minimum ten counties in which signatures were obtained. Utah Code Ann. § 20-3-2(g)(2) (Supp. 1971), set out in note 1, *supra*. After the first year, a new political party must hold organizational conventions in every county in the state. Utah Code Ann. § 20-4-1 (Supp. 1971). Thus the political party qualification requirements rest upon a rational basis: they are an intermediate step adapted to the orderly establishment of a statewide party organization. The requirement of such a statewide organization is a legitimate state purpose so long as it imposes no undue burden on the election process. *See,* Jenness v. Fortson, 403 U.S. 431, 91 S. Ct. 1970, 29 L. Ed. 2d 554 (1971); *cf., supra* note 5.

Traditionally political paries have exerted the greatest of influence upon state and national government. It is not unreasonable for a state to require such parties to provide even the residents of sparsely-settled counties with an opportunity to involve themselves in

party machinery which may ultimately control their state or county policies. In return for a party's commitment to statewide operation, the State of Utah sanctions primary elections for the parties and provides state recognition of party decisions concerning the selection of candidates. *E.g.*, Utah Code Ann. §§ 20-4-1 to 20-4-9 *Supp.* 1971)."

## CONCLUSIONS

The existing Illinois signature distribution requirement is a well reasoned enactment by the State legislature, intended and designed to effect equality in the electoral process, and not to impose an invidious discrimination.

Section 10-2 was expressly drafted to "pass muster" under the *Moore* v. *Ogilvie* standard, and to balance and weigh competing interests. It simply requires a new statewide party to organize in more than one county.

Unlike statutes requiring names from multiple counties, however sparse, the least populous Illinois counties do not have the power "completely to block" a nomination. Half the State population does reside in 101 counties.

Section 10-2 does not apply a "rigid, arbitrary formula" but reflects actual population distribution patterns, and assures that residents throughout the State have equal opportunity to be involved in statewide political party activities.

The Illinois statute screens out frivolous candidacies but does not make it "virtually impossible" for a new political party to appear on the statewide ballot, nor does it preclude minorities from access to the ballot.

The Illinois statutes does indeed further the legitimate State interest in "avoiding confusion, deception, and even frustration of the democratic process at the general election" so that "multifarious political associations with little or no popular support do not bemuse the electoral process."

Important Federal questions are raised which should be settled by this Court. For these reasons, Petitioners request that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM J. SCOTT,
Attorney General of Illinois,
160 North LaSalle,
Chicago, Illinois,

*Attorney for Petitioners.*

HERBERT LEE CAPLAN,
Assistant Attorney General,
312/793-3587
*Of Counsel.*

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1975

No.

TATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL E. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN J. LUNDING, JR. and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Petitioners,*

vs.

HE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS; ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

*Respondents.*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Herbert Lee Caplan, Assistant Illinois Attorney General, a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the nited States, and counsel for the Petitioners, hereby certify that I have this 24th day of September, 1975, served hree copies of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari pon Howard Eglit, Lance Haddix, Roger Baldwin Foundation of A.C.L.U., Inc., 5 South Wabash, Room 1516, Chicago, Illinois 60603 and John J. Abt, 299 Broadway, New ork, New York 10007, by depositing same, first class ostage prepaid, in the United States mail chute at 160 orth LaSalle, Chicago, Illinois. All parties required to be erved have been served.

HERBERT LEE CAPLAN.

In The

# United States Court of Appeals

## For The Seventh Circuit

## APPENDIX A

---

No. 74-1950

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

vs.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL L. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN W. LUNDING JR. and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Defendants-Appellants.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division

No. 74 C 2470

**William J. Lynch,** *Judge.*

---

ARGUED APRIL 23, 1975 — DECIDED JUNE 27, 1975

Before SWYGERT and TONE, *Circuit Judges,* and GRANT, *Senior District Judge.**

---

*Senior District Judge Robert A. Grant of the Northern District of Indiana is sitting by designation.

SWYGERT, *Circuit Judge.* Plaintiffs, the Communist Party of Illinois, several of its candidates for state office in the November 5, 1974 general election, and a registered voter desiring to vote for these candidates, filed suit for declaratory and injunctive relief against the State Board of Election Commissioners for the State of Illinois[1] seeking to challenge the constitutionality of a section of the Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stat. ch. 46, § 10-2. This statute requires any political party seeking statewide ballot recognition to submit petitions containing not less than 25,000 signatures of qualified voters, not more than 13,000 of which may be counted from any one county.[2] Plaintiffs

---

1. Members of the Board are also sued, both individually and in their capacities as members of the State Board of Elections.

2. The statute provides in relevant part:

> Any group of persons hereafter desiring to form a new political party throughout the State, or in any political subdivision greater than a county and less than the State, shall file with the State Board of Elections a petition as hereinafter provided . . . Any such petition for the formation of a new political party throughout the State . . . shall declare as concisely as may be the intention of the signers thereof to form such new political party in the State, or in such district or political subdivision; shall state in not more than 5 words the name of such new political party; shall contain a complete list of candidates of such party for all offices to be filled in the State, or such district or political subdivision as the case may be, at the next ensuing election then to be held; and, if such new political party shall be formed for the entire State, shall be signed by not less than 25,000 qualified voters. Provided, that no more than 13,000 signatures from the same county may be counted toward the required total of 25,000 signatures.

sought an order declaring the requirement limiting the number of signatories from any one county void as being unconstitutional, and injunctive relief requiring the defendants to certify plaintiff candidates so that they would be listed on the statewide ballot for the November, 1974 general election.

Initially, the district court entered an order, declaring section 10-2 unconstitutional and denying defendants' motion to convene a three-judge court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2281.[3] The court found section 10-2 violative of the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment in that it "discriminates against voters of the most populous county of the state in favor of voters in the less populous counties." The court found the claim that the section is not unconstitutional to be "Wholly without merit in light of a prior decision by a three-judge panel of this court declaring this same statutory provision unconstitutional in *Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie,* [357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972)], and other

---

3. Title 28 U.S.C. § 2281 provides:

> An interlocutory or permanent injunction restraining the enforcement, operation or execution of any State statute by restraining the action of any officer of such State in the enforcement or execution of such statute or of an order made by an administrative board or commission acting under State statutes, shall not be granted by any district court or judge thereof upon the ground of the unconstitutionality of such statute unless the application therefor is heard and determined by a district court of three judges under section 2284 of this title.

decisions declaring similar signature distribution requirements unconstitutional.'"[4] In response to this order, plaintiffs moved for injunctive relief. In a second order, the district court entered a preliminary injunction[5] directing

---

4. *Citing Williams* v. *Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23 (1968); *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Hare*, 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969); *Baird* v. *Davoren*, 346 F. Supp. 515 (D. Mass. 1972); *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes*, 318 F. Supp. 1262 (S.D. Ohio 1970); *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller*, 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y. 1970).

5. The original declaratory order purports to grant plaintiffs' "motion for a preliminary injunction." It does no more than declare section 10-2 unconstitutional, however, and does not direct any state officers to take any specific action or to refrain from taking action. This initial order is dated September 11, 1974 as is the minute order which accompanies it. The second, or preliminary injunction order, is also dated September 11, 1974, but is accompanied by and attached to a notice of motion and motion which are file stamped September 12, 1974. The minute order accompanying these papers is dated September 12, 1974 as well. Thus, the injunctive order appears to have been prepared by plaintiffs and signed (after limiting alterations) by the district judge subsequent to the entry of the declaratory order and in reliance upon that original order.

That order granting injunctive relief reads:

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

> Having declared the county distribution signature requirement of Section 10-2 of Illinois Revised Statutes, Ch. 46, Sec. 10-2 (1973) unconstitutional as violative of the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Con-

defendants to certify or cause to be certified plaintiff candidates for the November, 1974 election "if the only grounds for non-certification is failure to comply with the county distribution signature requirement."

Defendants appeal from both of these orders.[6] They contend that the issue of the constitutionality of section 10-2 has not been rendered "wholly without merit" by previous decisions, and that the district judge was therefore required by 28 U.S.C. § 2281 to convene a three-judge court in order to enjoin the enforcement of this state statute. They further contend that section 10-2 represents a non-arbitrary attempt by the State of Illinois to assure that residents throughout Illinois have "equal opportunity to be involved in statewide political party activi-

---

stitution of the United States by order of this Court, dated September 11, 1974, it is hereby ordered that defendants, their agents, and employees certify to the county clerk of each county in Illinois the plaintiff candidates as duty nominated candidates for election to state office in the general election to be held on November 5, 1974, if the only grounds for non-certification is failure to comply with the county distribution signature requirement.

WILLIAM J. LYNCH,
Judge, United States District Court

Dated: September 11, 1974.

6. The notice of appeal refers to "the order entered by District Court Judge William J. Lynch on September 11, 1974 declaring the county signature requirement of § 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code unconstitutional and granting a preliminary injunction," apparently treating the two orders as a single, consolidated order.

ties," and to assure that "multifarious political associations with little or no popular support do not bemuse the electoral process." They say section 10-2 does not, therefore, offend the Fourteenth Amendment.

In our view, the issue of whether the district court in this case should have convened a three-judge court prior to issuing the preliminary injunctive order directing the Board not to enforce section 10-2 against these plaintiffs in the November, 1974 general election is moot. That election is over; plaintiffs and defendants here have little stake in litigating the technical question of whether the relief obtained in connection with that election had a proper jurisdictional base. Plaintiff candidates were in fact certified and listed on the November ballot. The past cannot be retraced. A decision on the section 2281 question would be purely advisory at this point and would not affect the rights of these litigants insofar as the in junctive order is concerned.[7] *See Oil Workers Unions* v.

---

7. Section 2281 does not apply to the declaratory order alone either by its terms or as construed. *Kennedy* v. *Mendoza-Martinez,* 372 U.S. 144, 153-55 (1963); *Sands* v. *Wainwright,* 491 F. 2d 417, 422 (5th Cir. 1973). And while defendants-appellants argue the applicability of this statute to the injunctive order, they urge at the same time that we may proceed directly to the merits of this case even if we should hold that the case should originally have been heard by three judges. In effect, they ask for an opinion without a remedy. Curiously, it is the plaintiffs-appellees who contend that a reversal on the three-judge court issue would require remand for convening of such a court. The problem with this contention is that at the present time no injunctive relief is sought by plaintiffs. The only viable issue at this stage is the question of the constitutionality of section 10-2 and this issue would not require a three-judge

*Missouri*, 361 U.S. 363, 366-68 (1960); *North Carolina* v. *Rice*, 404 U.S. 244, 245-46 (1971).

II

The heart of this case is the district court's order declaring section 10-2 unconstitutional. This determination was based on the reasoning contained in a previous decision of a three-judge district court in this circuit declaring section 10-2 unconstitutional as violative of the equal protection provision of the Fourteenth Amendment, *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Ogilvie, supra*, and on the rationale of the Supreme Court's decision in *Moore* v. *Ogilvie*, 394 U.S. 814 (1969) holding a predecessor of section 10-2 unconstitutional on the same ground. We believe this determination was correct.

In *Moore* the Supreme Court had before it a statutory provision requiring certain independent candidates, in order to be certified for the statewide ballot in Illinois, to obtain the signatures of 25,000 qualified voters, including signatures of two hundred voters from each of at least fifty of the one hundred and two Illinois counties. The provision had been specifically upheld in a previous decision of the Supreme Court in *Mac Dougall* v. *Green*, 335 U.S. 281 (1948). Expressly overruling *Mac Dougall* as being "out of line with our recent apportion-

---

court, absent a request for injunction. A remand under these circumstances would indeed be pointless. The section 2281 question is therefore not "a real and substantial controversy admitting of specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character, as distinguished from an opinion advising what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts." *Aetna Life Ins. Co.* v. *Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 241 (1937).

ment cases," The Court in *Moore* framed the equal protection problem in these terms:

> It is no answer to the argument under the Equal Protection Clause that this law was designed to require statewide support for launching a new political party rather than support from a few localities. This law applies a rigid, arbitrary formula to sparsely settled counties and populous counties alike, contrary to the constitutional theme of equality among citizens in the exercise of their political rights The idea that one group can be granted greater voting strength than another is hostile to the one man, one vote basis of our representative government.
>
> Under this Illinois law the electorate in 49 of the counties which contain 93.4% of the registered voters may not form a new political party and place its candidates on the ballot. Yet 25,000 of the remaining 6.6% of registered voters properly distributed among the 53 remaining counties may form a new party to elect candidates to office. This law thus discriminates against the residents of the populous counties of the State in favor of rural sections. It, therefore, lacks the equality to which the exercise of political rights is entitled under the Fourteenth Amendment. 394 U.S. at 818-19.

Section 10-2 suffers the same constitutional defect. To paraphrase the Supreme Court in *Moore:* Under section 10-2 the entire electorate of Cook County, which represents 45% of all registered voters in Illinois, may not form a new political party and place its candidates on the ballot. Yet any 25,000 of the remaining 55% of registered voters properly distributed among the remaining 101 counties may form a new party to elect candidates to office. Put another way, the approximately 2,750,000 registered Illinois voters in urbanized Cook County do not have the power under

section 10-2 to create a statewide political party to protect their own peculiar interests, while 25,000 voters in any two or more counties in rural downstate Illinois may create such a party to protect their distinctly different, and often competing interests. This two-county requirement, like the fifty county requirement in *Moore*, "discriminates against the residents of the populous counties of the state in favor of rural sections."[8]

Given the fact that section 10-2 directly affects the fundamental right of a class of persons to "vote effectively" *Williams* v. *Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23, 30-34 (1969),[9] the statute cannot stand unless it is necessary to advance a compelling state interest. *Id.* at 31. If other means exist which will

---

8. In their brief appellants urge us to consider the "realities of Illinois politics." They point out that

> [t]he State is organized into 102 counties. Of these, Cook County, i.e. "Chicago", is uniquely the most urbanized county, and contains approximately 50% of the total State population. The land area of the remaining 101 counties, typically referred to as "Downstate", is primarily agricultural, and contains the remaining 50% of the population. Appellants' brief at 5.

We recognize these "realities," but we do not see how they can help appellants in this case. Rather, they point out further the problem inherent in the two-county requirement: While the agricultural interest groups may create a special interest party entirely among their own constituents, the Cook County urban interest groups cannot, but must garner some forty-eight percent of their petition signatures from relatively rural Illinois counties.

9. "[T]he voters can assert their preferences only through candidates or parties or both." *Lubin* v. *Parrish*, 415 U.S. 709, 716 (1974).

adequately protect the state interest involved, but which will be less intrusive on the right to vote or less discriminatory in effect, such other means must be employed and section 10-2 must be struck down. See *Dunn* v. *Blumstein*, 405 U.S. 330, 334-43 (1972).

In their brief, defendants contend that the county distribution requirement is necessary to prevent numerous parties with negligible popular support from overcrowding the ballot and thereby confusing and demeaning the statewide electoral process. In order to achieve this goal, defendants urge, with considerable candor, that the strength of the concentrated "Chicago" (Cook County) vote must be diluted:

> Politics is access to voters. The solicitation of nominating signatures and distribution of campaign literature are facilitated where the population is concentrated. A single high-rise apartment building in Chicago may contain more people than a county town, and several city blocks may contain more people than entire "downstate" counties. A Chicago precinct captain can personally contact more voters in an hour than his downstate counterpart may be able to reach in days of effort.
>
> Thus, a Chicago based, would-be new political party approaches any statewide election with an advantage that simply does not exist elsewhere in the State, and petition efforts, oherwise equal, produce greaer results in "Chicago."
>
> Consequently, minority parties from "Chicago" ab initio enjoy greater access to the ballot, and it is the vote effectiveness of downstate voters which is diluted by the demographic realities. Without some regulation, Chicago fringe candidates would easily flood the ballot.
>
> Balancing this inequality is the object of the signature distribution requirements of § 10-2. Appellants' brief at 10.

Assuming that a compelling need exists in Illinois to "protect" the integrity of its political processes from frivolous or fraudulent candidacies" *Bullock* v. *Carter*, 405 U.S. 134, 145 (1972), we cannot see how this interest is tied by necessity to a discriminatory diminution of the power of the individual voter in Cook County, or any other urbanized county. Similarly, if there is a permissible and compelling state interest in limiting the total number of candidates or parties on the statewide ballot independent of the question of the seriousness or legitimacy of such candidates or parties,[10] some method is surely available which will serve the interest without making the effectiveness of an Illinois citizen's electoral power depend on his geographical location within that state.

We do not, of course, suggest what means Illinois may employ to serve its interest in maintaining the integrity of its electoral process. We hold only that the county distribution requirement of section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, like its predecessor, "lacks the equality to

---

10. *See Generally Lubin* v. *Parrish*, 415 U.S. 709, 715-19 (1974) suggesting that the constitutionally permissible interest of the state in avoiding "laundry list" ballots is limited to the interest in screening out frivolous, non-serious parties or candidates, or those without "some reasonable quantum of voter support." *See also American Party of Texas* v. *White*, 415 U.S. 767, 781-82 (1974): "Of course, what is demanded may not be so excessive or impractical as to be in reality a mere device to always, or almost always, exclude parties with significant support from the ballot."

which the exercise of political rights is entitled under the Fourteenth Amendment." *Moore* v. *Ogilvie* at 819. The order of the district court declaring section 10-2 unconstitutional is therefore affirmed.

A true Copy:

Teste:

.....

*Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit*

## APPENDIX B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

| | |
|---|---|
| THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS; ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,<br>*Plaintiffs,*<br>v.<br>STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL E. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN J. LUNDING, JR., and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,<br>*Defendants.* | No. 74 C 2470 |

ORDER

1. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction declaring the "signature distribution requirement" contained in Section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stat. 1973, Chap. 46, Sec. 10-2, unconstitutional is hereby granted. The Court finds that the "signature distribution

requirement" constitutes an arbitrary formula which grants one group greater voting strength than another and discriminates against voters of the most populous county of the state in favor of voters in the less populous counties. *Communist Party of Illinois* v. *Ogilvie*, 357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972). See also *Moore* v. *Ogilvie*, 394 U.S. 814 (1969). The statutory provision challenged here offends the one man, one vote principle that is the basis of our representative form of government and accordingly the requirement must be struck down as violative of the Equal Protection Clause and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

2. Defendants' motion to convene a three-judge court is hereby denied. The Court finds no necessity to convene a three-judge panel as the claim that the statute is not unconstitutional is wholly without merit in light of a prior decision by a three-judge panel of this Court declaring this same statutory provision unconstitutional in *Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie, supra*, and other decisions declaring similar signature distribution requirements unconstitutional. *Williams* v. *Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23 (1968); *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Hare*, 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969); *Baird* v. *Davoren*, 346 F. Supp. 515 (D. Mass. 1972); *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes*, 318 F. Supp. 1262 (S.D. Ohio 1970); *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller*, 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y. 1970).

WILLIAM J. LYNCH,
Judge, United States District Court.

Dated: September 11, 1974.

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Having declared the county distribution signature requirement of Section 10-2 of Illinois Revised Statutes,

Ch. 46, Sec. 10-2 (1973) unconstitutional as violative of the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States by order of this Court, dated September 11, 1974, it is hereby ordered that defendants, their agents, and employees certify to the county clerk of each county in Illinois the plaintiff candidates as duly nominated candidates for election to state office in the general election to be held on November 5, 1974, if the only grounds for non-certification is failure to comply with the county distribution signature requirement.

WILLIAM J. LYNCH,

Judge, United States District Court.

Dated: September 11, 1974:

## APPENDIX C

The COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

RICHARD B. OGILVIE et al.,

*Defendants.*

No. 72 C 915

United States District Court,
N. D. Illinois, E. D.

Sept. 21, 1972

Before CUMMINGS, Circuit Judge, and MAROVITZ and McMILLEN, District Judges.

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

PER CURIAM.

This cause came on to be heard on plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction and the court having considered the complaint, the affidavits provided by plaintiffs and documents in opposition thereto, and having heard argument in open court, this court states as follows:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Plaintiffs are the Communist Party of Illinois, its candidates for public office for the election to be held on November 7, 1972 and the Reverend William E. Hogan, an Illinois voter suing on his own behalf and on behalf of other Illinois voters who wish to vote for candidates of the Communist Party of Illinois in the November 1972 election.

2. Defendants are Richard B. Ogilvie, individually and as Governor of the State of Illinois; John W. Lewis, individually and as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois; William J. Scott, individually and as Attorney General of the State of Illinois; Michael J. Howlett, individually and as Auditor of Public Accounts; Alan J. Dixon, individually and as State Treasurer of the State of Illinois; James Roman, individually and as Chairman of the State Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Illinois; Victor Smith, individually and as Chairman of the State Central Committee of the Republican Party of Illinois. Together they compose the State Electoral Board of the State of Illinois.

3. On or about January 31, 1972, plaintiff Communist Party of Illinois, in order to form itself as a new political party throughout Illinois, nominated plaintiff candidates to seek election in the 1972 general election and printed and distributed new political party petitions to gather the requisite number of signatures.

4. As of August 3, 1972, plaintiffs and their agents collected a total of 33,027 signatures, of which 26,735 were by voters residing in Cook County (a county containing slightly more than one-half the registered voters in the state of Illinois) and 6,292 were by voters residing outside of Cook County (containing slightly less than one-half of all the registered voters in the State of Illinois.)

5. On August 3, 1972, plaintiffs tendered their petitions to the Index Division of the Office of the Secretary of State and their tender was refused pursuant to a letter from Don Ed, Supervisor of the Index Division stating *inter alia:* Upon scanning the petition, it appears to meet with statutory requirements with the following exception: the petition was not accompanied with the so-called loyalty oaths for state offices as provided in section 7-10.1 of the Illinois Election Code. Therefore, the petition was not accepted for filing.

6. On August 8, 1972, the defendants were ordered by the Honorable Hubert L. Will to receive the petitions *nunc pro tunc* as of August 3, 1972. The petitions were tendered and received pursuant to that order.
7. On August 12, 1972, a challenge was filed to the Communist Party of Illinois new party petitions on grounds that they were not accompanied by loyalty oaths.
8. On September 6, 1972, a meeting of the Electoral Board was convened and sustained the objection to the validity of the petitions on ground that no loyalty oath had been filed.
9. On September 7, 1972, the Electoral Board reconvened and voted to deny certification of the Communist Party as a new political party so that its candidates would not be placed on the ballot. It based its ruling on the failure of the candidates of the Communist Party to sign loyalty oaths as required by Ch. 46, § 7-10.1, Ill. Rev. Stat. 1971 and failure to comply with the county signature requirement of Ch. 46, § 10-2, Ill. Rev. Stat. 1971

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

10. This court has jurisdiction pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 2201, 2202, 2281 and 2284 and Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
11. The loyalty oath requirement provided for by Ch. 46, § 7-10.1 and 10-5 is invalid in that:
    a. It is vague and overbroad on its face and therefore unconstitutional under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; See Livingston v. Ogilvie, 43 Ill. 2d 9, 250 N.E. 2d 138 (1969) (identical oath for candidates to the Illinois Constitutional Convention of 1969 held unconstitutional); Krehbiel v. Board of Education, 309 F. Supp. 630 (N.D. Ill. 1969) (three-judge court) (similar oath for Illi-

nois teachers held unconstitutional); Connell v. Higginbotham, 305 F. Supp. 445 (M.D. Fla. 1969) affirmed in part, reversed in part, 403 U.S. 207, 91 S. Ct. 1772, 29 L. Ed. 2d 418; Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General, 345 F. Supp. 1132 (S.D. Texas 1972). *See also* Elfbrandt v. Russell, 384 U.S. 11, 86 S. Ct. 1238, 16 L. Ed. 2d 321 (1966); Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589, 87 S. Ct. 675, 17 L. Ed. 2d 629 (1967); Whitehill v. Elkins, 389 U.S. 54, 88 S. Ct. 184, 19 L. Ed. 2d 228 (1967). Cole v. Richardson, 405 U.S. 676, 92 S. Ct. 1332, 31 L. Ed. 2d 593 (1972).

b. The affirmation of citizenship of the United States and the State of Illinois being the only constitutionally valid portion of the oath as it now reads, no substantial purpose would be served by salvaging that portion of the oath alone in view of the fact that Ill. Rev. Stat. 1971, ch. 46, § 10-5(3) requires a statement of candidacy that contains an implicit affirmation of citizenship. See Livingston v. Ogilvie, supra (Ill. Sup. Ct. made no attempt to salvage identical oath). In addition the practicalities of the situation militate against serving any portion of the oath since forcing the candidates of the petitioning party to sign an oath containing only the permissible clause, i.e. the affirmation of citizenship would involve delay where it cannot be justly tolerated in view of the imminence of the election. Once the election is over the state has ample opportunity to enact a permissible oath and invalidation of the whole oath in this instance will not determine any state interest in having some form of oath in the interim.

12. The County signature requirement of Ch. 46, § 10-2, Ill. Rev. Stat. 1971, permitting no more than 13,000 signatures of qualified voters from any one county

to be counted toward the total of 25,000 which are a prerequisite for recognition as a new political party, is a denial of equal protection guaranteed to voters by the Fourteenth Amendment in that it discriminates against voters of the most populous county of the state in favor of voters in the less populous counties. See Moore v. Ogilvie, 394 U.S. 814, 89 S. Ct. 1493, 23 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1969) (broader county-wide signature requirement in Illinois held unconstitutional); Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes, 318 F. Supp. 1262, 1272 (S.D. Ohio 1970); Socialist Workers Party v. Hare, 304 F. Supp. 534, 536 (E.D. Mich. 1969); Baird v. Davoren, 346 F. Supp. 515 (D. Mass. 1972).

13. Unless this court restrains the enforcement and implementation of the aforementioned unconstitutional statutory provisions, the plaintiffs will suffer serious and irreparable injury in that they will be prevented from qualifying for recognition as a new political party and will be deprived of a place on the ballot in the November 7, 1972 general election without adequate remedy at law.

It is therefore ordered, that defendants, their agents, servants, employees and attorneys and all persons in active concert and participation with them shall immediately certify plaintiffs Communist Party of Illinois as a new political party and immediately certify plaintiff candidates to all of the Illinois county clerks to be placed on the ballot in time for the November 7, 1972 general election.

NOTE: In view of the fact that the printing of Illinois ballots for the November 7, 1972 election has been held up pending decision of this case and considering the very short period remaining before that election, this Court has not included a written Opinion so that the expeditious entry of the appropriate relief may be facilitated.

McMILLEN, District Judge (dissenting):

I respectfully dissent from Conclusions of Law 11(a), 12 and 13, and the preliminary injunction entered in the above case.

The loyalty oath required for statewide candidates in Illinois as I read it, complies substantially with the requirements of Cole v. Richardson, 405 U.S. 676, 92 S. Ct. 1332, 31 L. Ed. 2d 593 (April 8, 1972) and is permissible under these circumstances. It reads:

> I, ..... do swear that I am a citizen of the United States and the State of Illinois, that I am not affiliated directly or indirectly with any communist organization or any communist front organization, or any foreign political agency, party, organization or government which advocates the overthrow of constitutional government by force or other means not permitted under the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of this State; that I do not directly or indirectly teach or advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States or of this State or any unlawful change in the form of the governments thereof by force or any unlawful means.
> [1971, Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 46, § 7-10.1]

Although this oath is not phrased or punctuated as precisely as we might prefer, its purport is clear enough and it should be construed to be constitutionally valid if possible. The extent that the Illinois version may go beyond the language specifically approved by the United States Supreme Court is a matter of semantics, not a matter of substance. As I understand the defendants' position, the oath is not required for candidates whose oath is prescribed by the Federal Constitution.

Furthermore, I believe that some geographical distribution of signatories on petitions is justified before a political

party is entitled to participate in a state-wide election. The distribution required by the Illinois statute is a reasonable one, fulfilling the legislature's apparent desire not to saddle the citizens of the entire state with unjustified expenses, complexity of issues, and burdens on election judges. Giving voters outside of Cook County some voice in this determination conforms with, rather than violates, the principles of one-man one-vote recognized by the majority of the Supreme Court in Moore v. Ogilvie, 394 U.S. 814, 89 S. Ct. 1493, 23 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1969).

PAGES BOUND VERTICALLY



## ILLINOIS GENERAL ELECTION
## NOVEMBER 5, 1974
## SUMMARY OF GENERAL VOTE

| Office, Party and Candidate | | Plurality | Total In State | Outside Cook County | Cook County | Counties Carried |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **UNITED STATES SENATOR** | | | | | | |
| Democratic | Adlai E. Stevenson | 726,612 | 1,811,496 | 873,173 | 938,323 | 78 |
| Republican | George M. Burditt | ..... | 1,084,884 | 675,104 | 409,780 | |
| Socialist Workers Party | Edward Thomas Heisler | ..... | 12,413 | 5,623 | 6,790 | |
| Communist Party | Ishmael Flory | ..... | 5,873 | 1,648 | 4,225 | |
| **STATE TREASURER** | | | | | | |
| Democratic | Alan J. Dixon | 842,216 | 1,796,144 | 897,944 | 898,200 | 89 |
| Republican | Harry Page | ..... | 953,928 | 602,635 | 351,293 | |
| Socialist Workers Party | Suzanne Haig | ..... | 20,240 | 9,029 | 11,211 | |
| Communist Party | Lorraine M. Ashby | ..... | 8,070 | 2,631 | 5,439 | |
| **TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS** | | | | | | |
| Democratic | Nina T. Shepherd | ..... | 1,535,875 | 757,073 | 778,802 | |
| | Arthur R. Velasquez | ..... | 1,378,577 | 662,782 | 715,795 | |
| | Robert J. Lenz | ..... | 1,409,944 | 709,944 | 700,000 | |
| Republican | Timothy W. Swain | ..... | 1,151,284 | 701,094 | 450,190 | |
| | Russell W. Steger | ..... | 1,107,032 | 683,070 | 423,962 | |
| | Gardner W. Heidrick | ..... | 1,042,875 | 640,904 | 401,971 | |
| Socialist Workers Party | Antonio DeLeon | ..... | 34,165 | 11,142 | 23,023 | |
| | Mary R. Wismer | ..... | 50,752 | 18,952 | 31,800 | |
| | Brian Williams | ..... | 34,376 | 12,107 | 22,269 | |
| Communist Party | John R. Lumpkin | ..... | 17,256 | 5,852 | 11,404 | |
| | Jay Schaffner | ..... | 17,099 | 6,103 | 10,996 | |
| | Valerie Witzkowski | ..... | 27,006 | 9,358 | 17,648 | |

## VOTE FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR— NOVEMBER 5, 1974

| Counties | Plurality | Democratic<br>Adlai E. Stevenson | Republican<br>George M. Burditt | Socialist Workers Party<br>Edward Thomas Heisler | Communist Party<br>Ishmael Flory |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | D 3,888 | 11,959 | 8,071 | 60 | 50 |
| Alexander | D 874 | 2,819 | 1,945 | 39 | 3 |
| Bond | D 678 | 2,995 | 2,317 | 7 | 4 |
| Boone | R 22 | 2,732 | 2,754 | 16 | 3 |
| Brown | D 764 | 1,701 | 937 | 2 | 1 |
| Bureau | D 1,452 | 8,072 | 6,620 | 0 | 0 |
| Calhoun | D 629 | 1,541 | 912 | 6 | 3 |
| Carroll | D 50 | 3,397 | 3,347 | 10 | 0 |
| Cass | D 1,151 | 3,046 | 1,895 | 3 | 1 |
| Champaign | D 3,994 | 20,808 | 16,814 | 745 | 112 |
| Christian | D 3,743 | 7,237 | 3,494 | 16 | 6 |
| Clark | D 47 | 3,349 | 3,302 | 7 | 0 |
| Clay | D 403 | 3,387 | 2,984 | 13 | 2 |
| Clinton | D 2,593 | 6,386 | 3,793 | 9 | 2 |
| Coles | D 972 | 7,055 | 6,083 | 43 | 12 |
| Cook | D 528,543 | 938,323 | 409,780 | 6,790 | 4,225 |
| Crawford | D 1,084 | 4,338 | 3,254 | 7 | 1 |
| Cumberland | D 520 | 2,190 | 1,670 | 8 | 1 |
| DeKalb | D 821 | 7,927 | 7,106 | 199 | 43 |
| DeWitt | D 524 | 3,296 | 2,772 | 5 | 2 |
| Douglas | D 112 | 3,240 | 3,128 | 7 | 2 |
| DuPage | R 17,476 | 52,004 | 69,480 | 716 | 165 |
| Edgar | D 692 | 4,652 | 3,960 | 6 | 0 |
| Edwards | R 274 | 1,426 | 1,700 | 4 | 0 |
| Effingham | D 1,269 | 5,184 | 3,915 | 9 | 5 |
| Fayette | D 881 | 4,639 | 3,758 | 5 | 4 |
| Ford | R 783 | 2,558 | 3,341 | 1 | 1 |
| Franklin | D 5,365 | 9,136 | 3,771 | 32 | 17 |
| Fulton | D 3,179 | 8,071 | 4,892 | 36 | 16 |
| Gallatin | D 1,406 | 2,437 | 1,031 | 4 | 2 |
| Greene | D 1,460 | 3,569 | 2,109 | 6 | 1 |
| Grundy | D 776 | 5,416 | 4,640 | 19 | 4 |
| Hamilton | D 580 | 2,559 | 1,979 | 11 | 4 |
| Hancock | D 359 | 4,079 | 3,720 | 9 | 0 |
| Hardin | D 244 | 1,499 | 1,255 | 7 | 1 |
| Henderson | D 464 | 2,083 | 1,619 | 2 | 0 |
| Henry | D 909 | 7,175 | 6,266 | 34 | 19 |
| Iroquois | R 1,162 | 5,524 | 6,686 | 7 | 1 |
| Jackson | D 5,223 | 10,949 | 5,726 | 148 | 108 |
| Jasper | D 806 | 2,501 | 1,695 | 7 | 2 |
| Jefferson | D 2,199 | 6,738 | 4,539 | 11 | 4 |
| Jersey | D 1,478 | 4,137 | 2,659 | 13 | 1 |
| JoDaviess | D 787 | 3,476 | 2,689 | 11 | 1 |
| Johnson | R 164 | 1,623 | 1,787 | 9 | 2 |
| Kane | R 2,205 | 23,007 | 25,212 | 266 | 96 |
| Kankakee | D 1,999 | 15,592 | 13,593 | 157 | 22 |
| Kendall | R 1,729 | 2,563 | 4,292 | 16 | 3 |
| Knox | D 1,280 | 9,161 | 7,881 | 50 | 17 |
| Lake | D 6,063 | 44,191 | 38,128 | 413 | 117 |
| LaSalle | D 7,326 | 20,022 | 12,696 | 103 | 26 |
| Lawrence | D 457 | 3,393 | 2,936 | 5 | 1 |
| Lee | R 306 | 4,310 | 4,616 | 7 | 4 |
| Livingston | R 1,224 | 4,823 | 6,047 | 11 | 7 |
| Logan | R 80 | 4,818 | 4,898 | 9 | 2 |
| Macon | D 10,204 | 19,772 | 9,568 | 69 | 11 |
| Macoupin | D 5,044 | 10,775 | 5,731 | 36 | 8 |
| Madison | D 20,181 | 35,231 | 15,050 | 116 | 42 |
| Marion | D 3,489 | 8,321 | 4,832 | 27 | 7 |
| Marshall | D 400 | 2,802 | 2,402 | 2 | 0 |
| Mason | D 1,084 | 3,286 | 2,202 | 3 | 0 |

## VOTE FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR—NOVEMBER 5, 1974—Concluded

| Counties | Plurality | Democratic<br>Adlai E. Stevenson | Republican<br>George M. Burditt | Socialist Workers Party<br>Edward Thomas Heisler | Communist Party<br>Ishmael Flory |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| lassac | R 71 | 2,514 | 2,585 | 9 | 4 |
| cDonough | R 896 | 3,773 | 4,669 | 22 | 3 |
| cHenry | R 1,001 | 14,881 | 15,882 | 157 | 44 |
| cLean | R 2,266 | 11,803 | 14,069 | 97 | 21 |
| enard | R 172 | 1,974 | 2,146 | 8 | 5 |
| ercer | D 775 | 3,457 | 2,682 | 3 | 0 |
| onroe | D 701 | 4,231 | 3,530 | 8 | 1 |
| ontgomery | D 2,625 | 7,345 | 4,720 | 12 | 4 |
| organ | D 1,384 | 6,751 | 5,367 | 8 | 5 |
| oultrie | D 908 | 2,729 | 1,821 | 15 | 2 |
| gle | R 599 | 5,262 | 5,861 | 27 | 5 |
| oria | D 8,003 | 28,604 | 20,601 | 159 | 42 |
| rry | D 1,889 | 5,491 | 3,602 | 6 | 2 |
| att | D 532 | 3,334 | 2,802 | 4 | 3 |
| ke | D 1,484 | 4,402 | 2,918 | 1 | 3 |
| pe | R 71 | 867 | 938 | 1 | 1 |
| laski | D 549 | 2,021 | 1,472 | 5 | 4 |
| tnam | D 683 | 1,688 | 1,005 | 3 | 1 |
| ndolph | D 3,490 | 8,538 | 5,048 | 15 | 5 |
| chland | D 777 | 3,556 | 2,779 | 13 | 2 |
| ock Island | D 13,379 | 28,282 | 14,903 | 106 | 64 |
| aline | D 2,127 | 6,239 | 4,112 | 1 | 0 |
| ngamon | D 5,423 | 30,894 | 25,471 | 250 | 148 |
| huyler | D 270 | 2,099 | 1,829 | 15 | 0 |
| ott | D 349 | 1,563 | 1,214 | 4 | 3 |
| elby | D 2,081 | 5,268 | 3,187 | 8 | 1 |
| ark | R 81 | 1,313 | 1,394 | 5 | 1 |
| . Clair | D 27,979 | 45,439 | 17,460 | 257 | 75 |
| ephenson | D 851 | 5,712 | 4,861 | 53 | 10 |
| azewell | D 5,924 | 18,190 | 12,266 | 65 | 14 |
| nion | D 1,924 | 3,977 | 2,053 | 0 | 0 |
| rmilion | D 5,464 | 16,436 | 10,972 | 93 | 50 |
| abash | D 717 | 3,063 | 2,346 | 5 | 0 |
| arren | R 429 | 3,144 | 3,573 | 10 | 4 |
| ashington | R 371 | 2,763 | 3,134 | 9 | 1 |
| ayne | R 619 | 3,371 | 3,990 | 6 | 0 |
| hite | D 973 | 4,662 | 3,689 | 15 | 3 |
| hiteside | R 296 | 7,530 | 7,826 | 56 | 9 |
| ill | D 11,085 | 35,234 | 24,149 | 245 | 63 |
| illiamson | D 3,698 | 10,630 | 6,932 | 33 | 15 |
| innebago | D 15,183 | 39,505 | 24,322 | 208 | 58 |
| oodford | R 764 | 3,661 | 4,425 | 7 | 3 |
| TOTAL | D 726,612 | 1,811,496 | 1,084,884 | 12,413 | 5,873 |
| Downstate | D 198,069 | 873,173 | 675,104 | 5,623 | 1,648 |
| Cook County | D 528,543 | 938,323 | 409,780 | 6,790 | 4,225 |

urality is computed from the Democratic and Republican votes.

## VOTE FOR STATE TREASURER—
## NOVEMBER 5, 1974

| Counties | Plurality | Democratic | Republican | Socialist Workers Party | Communist Party |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Alan J. Dixon | Harry Page | Suzanne Haig | Lorraine M. Ashby |
| Adams | D 6,363 | 13,090 | 6,727 | 71 | 55 |
| Alexander | D 668 | 2,572 | 1,904 | 27 | 10 |
| Bond | D 614 | 2,818 | 2,204 | 12 | 1 |
| Boone | D 377 | 2,877 | 2,500 | 37 | 2 |
| Brown | D 905 | 1,721 | 816 | 7 | 1 |
| Bureau | D 1,397 | 7,724 | 6,327 | 0 | 0 |
| Calhoun | D 498 | 1,385 | 887 | 7 | 3 |
| Carroll | D 144 | 3,252 | 3,108 | 7 | 5 |
| Cass | D 1,515 | 3,143 | 1,628 | 5 | 1 |
| Champaign | D 8,076 | 22,690 | 14,614 | 649 | 162 |
| Christian | D 4,351 | 7,341 | 2,990 | 16 | 7 |
| Clark | D 437 | 3,428 | 2,991 | 6 | 0 |
| Clay | D 281 | 3,163 | 2,882 | 8 | 4 |
| Clinton | D 2,998 | 6,414 | 3,416 | 11 | 5 |
| Coles | D 2,158 | 7,463 | 5,305 | 89 | 43 |
| Cook | D 546,907 | 898,200 | 351,293 | 11,211 | 5,439 |
| Crawford | D 822 | 4,074 | 3,252 | 5 | 5 |
| Cumberland | D 681 | 2,168 | 1,487 | 10 | 8 |
| DeKalb | D 1,929 | 8,365 | 6,436 | 208 | 48 |
| DeWitt | D 1,064 | 3,473 | 2,409 | 6 | 5 |
| Douglas | D 447 | 3,323 | 2,876 | 3 | 4 |
| DuPage | R 883 | 59,325 | 60,208 | 1,422 | 344 |
| Edgar | D 781 | 4,532 | 3,751 | 9 | 4 |
| Edwards | R 443 | 1,238 | 1,681 | 3 | 1 |
| Effingham | D 1,653 | 5,170 | 3,517 | 10 | 7 |
| Fayette | D 1,121 | 4,585 | 3,464 | 12 | 5 |
| Ford | R 384 | 2,730 | 3,114 | 3 | 1 |
| Franklin | D 4,908 | 8,704 | 3,796 | 59 | 27 |
| Fulton | D 4,223 | 8,463 | 4,240 | 65 | 34 |
| Gallatin | D 1,251 | 2,222 | 971 | 7 | 3 |
| Greene | D 829 | 3,099 | 2,270 | 8 | 3 |
| Grundy | D 1,153 | 5,411 | 4,258 | 25 | 14 |
| Hamilton | D 631 | 2,448 | 1,817 | 12 | 9 |
| Hancock | D 78 | 3,772 | 3,694 | 15 | 5 |
| Hardin | D 106 | 1,355 | 1,249 | 7 | 3 |
| Henderson | D 243 | 1,923 | 1,680 | 5 | 0 |
| Henry | D 880 | 7,035 | 6,155 | 62 | 19 |
| Iroquois | D 126 | 5,791 | 5,665 | 10 | 0 |
| Jackson | D 5,388 | 10,759 | 5,371 | 342 | 96 |
| Jasper | D 864 | 2,442 | 1,578 | 7 | 2 |
| Jefferson | D 2,508 | 6,466 | 3,958 | 10 | 6 |
| Jersey | D 1,383 | 3,906 | 2,523 | 8 | 4 |
| JoDaviess | R 36 | 2,759 | 2,795 | 19 | 4 |
| Johnson | R 349 | 1,458 | 1,807 | 9 | 1 |
| Kane | D 3,203 | 25,309 | 22,106 | 513 | 151 |
| Kankakee | D 5,156 | 16,884 | 11,728 | 181 | 34 |
| Kendall | R 878 | 2,884 | 3,762 | 17 | 1 |
| Knox | D 2,584 | 9,671 | 7,087 | 84 | 31 |
| Lake | D 12,890 | 46,750 | 33,860 | 845 | 159 |
| LaSalle | D 8,561 | 20,254 | 11,693 | 176 | 32 |
| Lawrence | D 460 | 3,280 | 2,820 | 11 | 2 |
| Lee | D 334 | 4,498 | 4,164 | 19 | 9 |
| Livingston | R 312 | 4,989 | 5,301 | 7 | 3 |
| Logan | D 1,235 | 5,364 | 4,129 | 5 | 5 |
| Macon | D 11,350 | 20,326 | 8,976 | 107 | 28 |
| Macoupin | D 4,975 | 10,578 | 5,603 | 75 | 21 |
| Madison | D 19,810 | 32,860 | 13,050 | 215 | 53 |
| Marion | D 3,361 | 8,102 | 4,741 | 53 | 11 |
| Marshall | D 736 | 2,872 | 2,136 | 7 | 0 |
| Mason | D 1,647 | 3,493 | 1,846 | 4 | 0 |

## VOTE FOR STATE TREASURER—
## NOVEMBER 5, 1974—Concluded

| Counties | Plurality | Democratic<br>Alan J. Dixon | Republican<br>Harry Page | Socialist Workers Party<br>Suzanne Haig | Communist Party<br>Lorraine M. Ashby |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Massac | R 186 | 2,263 | 2,449 | 10 | 10 |
| McDonough | D 135 | 4,178 | 4,043 | 31 | 3 |
| McHenry | D 332 | 15,049 | 14,717 | 393 | 114 |
| McLean | D 4,038 | 14,725 | 10,687 | 161 | 31 |
| Menard | D 245 | 2,163 | 1,918 | 10 | 4 |
| Mercer | D 715 | 3,295 | 2,580 | 4 | 1 |
| Monroe | D 1,201 | 4,401 | 3,200 | 14 | 4 |
| Montgomery | D 2,918 | 7,258 | 4,340 | 9 | 5 |
| Morgan | D 2,448 | 7,166 | 4,718 | 9 | 5 |
| Moultrie | D 1,148 | 2,751 | 1,603 | 14 | 6 |
| Ogle | D 7 | 5,362 | 5,355 | 65 | 13 |
| Peoria | D 13,268 | 30,662 | 17,394 | 275 | 80 |
| Perry | D 1,687 | 5,174 | 3,487 | 9 | 5 |
| Piatt | D 892 | 3,417 | 2,525 | 7 | 5 |
| Pike | D 1,305 | 4,130 | 2,825 | 3 | 2 |
| Pope | R 169 | 761 | 930 | 1 | 1 |
| Pulaski | D 396 | 1,857 | 1,461 | 3 | 3 |
| Putnam | D 692 | 1,637 | 945 | 7 | 0 |
| Randolph | D 3,346 | 8,151 | 4,805 | 20 | 15 |
| Richland | D 562 | 3,254 | 2,692 | 18 | 7 |
| Rock Island | D 13,236 | 26,938 | 13,702 | 294 | 93 |
| Saline | D 1,710 | 5,716 | 4,006 | 4 | 2 |
| Sangamon | D 10,538 | 32,881 | 22,343 | 436 | 159 |
| Schuyler | D 348 | 2,093 | 1,745 | 7 | 3 |
| Scott | D 293 | 1,490 | 1,197 | 6 | 5 |
| Shelby | D 2,569 | 5,384 | 2,815 | 16 | 2 |
| Stark | D 113 | 1,367 | 1,254 | 6 | 1 |
| St. Clair | D 33,885 | 47,826 | 13,941 | 291 | 110 |
| Stephenson | D 1,110 | 5,715 | 4,605 | 84 | 46 |
| Tazewell | D 8,750 | 19,143 | 10,393 | 111 | 40 |
| Union | D 1,642 | 3,622 | 1,980 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermilion | D 7,717 | 17,268 | 9,551 | 118 | 70 |
| Wabash | D 621 | 2,883 | 2,262 | 8 | 2 |
| Warren | R 531 | 2,957 | 3,488 | 16 | 3 |
| Washington | R 246 | 2,718 | 2,964 | 9 | 2 |
| Wayne | R 767 | 3,162 | 3,929 | 5 | 2 |
| White | D 1,048 | 4,398 | 3,350 | 14 | 11 |
| Whiteside | R 511 | 7,192 | 7,703 | 61 | 25 |
| Will | D 17,544 | 37,862 | 20,318 | 460 | 98 |
| Williamson | D 2,992 | 9,505 | 6,513 | 51 | 25 |
| Winnebago | D 21,392 | 42,049 | 20,657 | 330 | 114 |
| Woodford | D 8 | 3,930 | 3,922 | 7 | 3 |
| TOTAL | D 842,216 | 1,796,144 | 953,928 | 20,240 | 8,070 |
| Downstate | D 295,309 | 897,944 | 602,635 | 9,029 | 2,631 |
| Cook County | D 546,907 | 898,200 | 351,293 | 11,211 | 5,439 |

Plurality is computed from the Democratic and Republican votes.

## VOTE FOR TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—NOVEMBER 5, 1974

| Counties | Democratic | | | Republican | | | Socialist Workers Party | | | Communist Party | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Nina T. Shepherd | Arthur R. Velasquez | Robert J. Lenz | Timothy W. Swain | Russell W. Steger | Gardner W. Heidrick | Antonio DeLeon | Mary R. Wismer | Brian Williams | John R. Lumpkin | Jay Schaffner | Valerie Witzkowski |
| Adams | 9,396 | 7,702 | 9,068 | 9,041 | 9,042 | 8,205 | 131 | 208 | 190 | 91 | 126 | 110 |
| Alexander | 2,331 | 2,180 | 2,262 | 1,744 | 1,747 | 1,680 | 22 | 39 | 42 | 12 | 8 | 6 |
| Bond | 2,635 | 2,492 | 2,541 | 2,142 | 2,134 | 2,118 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Boone | 2,155 | 1,740 | 1,912 | 2,921 | 2,827 | 2,679 | 31 | 75 | 47 | 17 | 18 | 22 |
| Brown | 1,463 | 1,351 | 1,406 | 867 | 866 | 766 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Bureau | 6,403 | 5,860 | 6,082 | 7,039 | 7,030 | 6,867 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Calhoun | 1,266 | 1,198 | 1,258 | 837 | 857 | 821 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| Carroll | 2,766 | 2,519 | 2,629 | 3,334 | 3,363 | 3,294 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 4 |
| Cass | 2,563 | 2,375 | 2,483 | 1,762 | 1,725 | 1,617 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Champaign | 18,121 | 13,853 | 15,248 | 19,759 | 19,162 | 17,000 | 778 | 1,344 | 802 | 510 | 376 | 838 |
| Christian | 6,831 | 6,422 | 6,621 | 3,220 | 3,267 | 3,109 | 20 | 31 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 15 |
| Clark | 3,252 | 3,057 | 3,151 | 2,977 | 2,935 | 2,910 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Clay | 2,947 | 2,671 | 2,772 | 2,671 | 2,674 | 2,603 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| Clinton | 5,295 | 4,900 | 5,038 | 3,477 | 3,512 | 3,466 | 11 | 16 | 18 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| Coles | 6,150 | 5,849 | 5,529 | 5,840 | 5,970 | 5,047 | 252 | 477 | 208 | 346 | 157 | 121 |
| Cook | 778,802 | 715,795 | 700,000 | 450,190 | 423,962 | 401,971 | 23,023 | 31,800 | 22,269 | 11,404 | 10,996 | 17,648 |
| Crawford | 3,905 | 3,661 | 3,776 | 3,307 | 3,340 | 3,253 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| Cumberland | 2,033 | 1,855 | 1,927 | 1,547 | 1,581 | 1,509 | 7 | 15 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 5 |
| DeKalb | 6,363 | 5,388 | 5,564 | 7,751 | 7,637 | 7,151 | 310 | 463 | 344 | 114 | 111 | 142 |
| DeWitt | 2,744 | 2,280 | 2,782 | 2,712 | 2,689 | 2,586 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Douglas | 2,739 | 2,464 | 2,668 | 3,293 | 3,385 | 3,206 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| DuPage | 51,451 | 41,139 | 42,000 | 72,641 | 68,352 | 64,199 | 1,429 | 2,954 | 1,360 | 636 | 770 | 1,896 |
| Edgar | 4,169 | 3,808 | 3,965 | 3,829 | 3,848 | 3,737 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Edwards | 1,188 | 1,077 | 1,167 | 1,534 | 1,552 | 1,539 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Effingham | 4,137 | 3,681 | 3,891 | 3,249 | 3,299 | 3,093 | 11 | 17 | 25 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| Fayette | 4,282 | 4,110 | 4,220 | 3,441 | 3,475 | 3,413 | 6 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Ford | 1,999 | 1,786 | 1,945 | 3,541 | 3,547 | 3,435 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Franklin | 7,815 | 7,238 | 7,417 | 4,127 | 3,443 | 3,214 | 65 | 86 | 89 | 48 | 33 | 45 |
| Fulton | 7,242 | 6,218 | 6,730 | 5,194 | 4,756 | 4,432 | 60 | 119 | 78 | 57 | 46 | 51 |
| Gallatin | 2,097 | 1,988 | 2,037 | 981 | 979 | 959 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Greene | 3,065 | 2,780 | 2,893 | 2,129 | 2,014 | 1,924 | 10 | 16 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Grundy | 4,516 | 4,049 | 4,295 | 4,629 | 4,659 | 4,451 | 25 | 35 | 41 | 14 | 12 | 22 |
| Hamilton | 2,244 | 2,093 | 2,151 | 1,775 | 1,773 | 1,723 | 8 | 14 | 20 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Hancock | 2,921 | 2,607 | 2,794 | 3,606 | 3,563 | 3,377 | 9 | 17 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Hardin | 1,198 | 1,086 | 1,121 | 1,094 | 1,068 | 1,037 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Henderson | 1,770 | 1,637 | 1,719 | 1,698 | 1,710 | 1,659 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Henry | 6,007 | 5,296 | 5,594 | 7,147 | 7,026 | 6,677 | 63 | 97 | 73 | 32 | 33 | 41 |
| Iroquois | 4,638 | 4,177 | 4,645 | 6,511 | 6,530 | 6,272 | 10 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Jackson | 8,891 | 8,032 | 8,454 | 5,903 | 5,864 | 5,424 | 415 | 599 | 415 | 282 | 280 | 385 |
| Jasper | 2,245 | 2,073 | 2,168 | 1,530 | 1,583 | 1,518 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jefferson | 5,910 | 5,465 | 5,770 | 3,868 | 3,847 | 3,757 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 10 |
| Jersey | 3,631 | 3,294 | 3,602 | 2,571 | 2,545 | 2,434 | 10 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Jo Daviess | 2,259 | 1,939 | 2,052 | 2,561 | 2,573 | 2,484 | 9 | 18 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Johnson | 1,349 | 1,251 | 1,316 | 1,661 | 1,701 | 1,630 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Kane | 21,344 | 17,022 | 17,714 | 25,850 | 24,997 | 22,888 | 660 | 1,319 | 655 | 310 | 412 | 720 |
| Kankakee | 13,954 | 13,297 | 14,019 | 14,360 | 14,192 | 13,586 | 128 | 154 | 167 | 61 | 55 | 73 |
| Kendall | 2,254 | 1,926 | 2,019 | 4,270 | 4,284 | 4,160 | 19 | 30 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Knox | 8,203 | 7,200 | 7,817 | 8,017 | 7,903 | 7,424 | 115 | 159 | 122 | 61 | 60 | 61 |
| Lake | 40,234 | 32,418 | 33,591 | 40,183 | 40,286 | 35,707 | 1,154 | 2,081 | 960 | 433 | 544 | 965 |
| LaSalle | 17,746 | 15,467 | 16,684 | 13,367 | 12,729 | 11,940 | 158 | 259 | 214 | 65 | 72 | 94 |
| Lawrence | 3,076 | 2,700 | 2,856 | 2,725 | 2,759 | 2,646 | 13 | 10 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 3 |
| Lee | 3,392 | 3,173 | 3,060 | 4,683 | 4,703 | 4,306 | 60 | 176 | 77 | 39 | 78 | 39 |
| Livingston | 4,017 | 3,609 | 3,927 | 5,973 | 5,921 | 5,708 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Logan | 3,788 | 3,246 | 4,233 | 4,810 | 4,778 | 4,407 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| Macon | 16,705 | 14,756 | 16,244 | 11,332 | 11,468 | 10,238 | 197 | 357 | 230 | 109 | 70 | 100 |
| Macoupin | 9,853 | 8,822 | 9,270 | 5,538 | 5,586 | 5,161 | 174 | 209 | 140 | 98 | 111 | 118 |
| Madison | 31,555 | 28,929 | 30,600 | 14,201 | 14,615 | 13,813 | 259 | 334 | 272 | 109 | 96 | 130 |
| Marion | 7,611 | 6,789 | 7,114 | 4,749 | 4,661 | 4,425 | 62 | 111 | 87 | 31 | 36 | 43 |
| Marshall | 2,347 | 2,113 | 2,512 | 2,610 | 2,476 | 2,326 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mason | 2,851 | 2,629 | 2,832 | 2,173 | 2,098 | 2,019 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Massac | 2,051 | 1,860 | 1,947 | 2,278 | 2,229 | 2,213 | 12 | 19 | 17 | 10 | 13 | 8 |
| McDonough | 3,118 | 2,774 | 2,908 | 4,755 | 4,562 | 4,425 | 51 | 66 | 49 | 11 | 11 | 23 |
| McHenry | 12,283 | 9,930 | 10,523 | 16,578 | 16,250 | 15,374 | 292 | 481 | 322 | 98 | 119 | 160 |
| McLean | 10,397 | 7,743 | 12,410 | 14,513 | 12,994 | 12,111 | 208 | 354 | 225 | 88 | 81 | 118 |
| Menard | 1,695 | 1,507 | 1,675 | 2,070 | 2,077 | 1,975 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| Mercer | 2,742 | 2,497 | 2,800 | 2,829 | 2,863 | 2,719 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Monroe | 3,446 | 3,206 | 3,287 | 3,345 | 3,415 | 3,302 | 11 | 24 | 22 | 4 | 7 | 8 |
| Montgomery | 6,688 | 6,293 | 6,489 | 4,381 | 4,410 | 4,272 | 13 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Morgan | 5,807 | 4,981 | 5,151 | 5,790 | 5,591 | 5,171 | 27 | 30 | 20 | 8 | 13 | 13 |
| Moultrie | 2,337 | 2,151 | 2,287 | 1,761 | 1,795 | 1,706 | 9 | 21 | 17 | 9 | 5 | 7 |
| Ogle | 3,670 | 2,923 | 3,520 | 6,151 | 6,011 | 5,685 | 51 | 111 | 80 | 28 | 34 | 22 |
| Peoria | 23,845 | 18,273 | 22,106 | 27,555 | 21,852 | 20,329 | 377 | 923 | 428 | 214 | 332 | 489 |
| Perry | 4,358 | 4,068 | 4,218 | 3,346 | 3,234 | 3,175 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Piatt | 2,813 | 2,478 | 2,807 | 3,045 | 3,085 | 2,862 | 11 | 20 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 7 |
| Pike | 3,748 | 3,410 | 3,602 | 2,983 | 2,967 | 2,849 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Pope | 734 | 695 | 717 | 917 | 900 | 886 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Pulaski | 1,587 | 1,469 | 1,565 | 1,338 | 1,321 | 1,288 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Putnam | 1,252 | 1,167 | 1,281 | 1,154 | 1,078 | 1,031 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Randolph | 7,535 | 7,361 | 7,455 | 4,973 | 4,999 | 4,898 | 16 | 26 | 33 | 18 | 12 | 9 |
| Richland | 2,888 | 2,464 | 2,615 | 2,414 | 2,449 | 2,398 | 14 | 29 | 21 | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| Rock Island | 23,000 | 21,495 | 22,553 | 16,019 | 16,850 | 15,793 | 255 | 419 | 445 | 168 | 206 | 271 |
| Saline | 5,399 | 5,144 | 5,229 | 3,993 | 4,026 | 3,940 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Sangamon | 26,923 | 23,275 | 25,277 | 24,400 | 24,262 | 22,771 | 970 | 1,245 | 915 | 583 | 640 | 810 |
| Schuyler | 1,861 | 1,752 | 1,788 | 1,839 | 1,804 | 1,776 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Scott | 1,271 | 1,124 | 1,176 | 1,210 | 1,227 | 1,162 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Shelby | 4,675 | 4,411 | 4,709 | 2,969 | 3,033 | 2,865 | 16 | 23 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Stark | 1,123 | 998 | 1,101 | 1,431 | 1,409 | 1,340 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| St. Clair | 38,933 | 36,891 | 38,408 | 17,787 | 18,798 | 17,582 | 332 | 498 | 427 | 158 | 185 | 241 |
| Stephenson | 4,584 | 3,787 | 4,486 | 5,357 | 5,169 | 4,857 | 99 | 225 | 132 | 76 | 85 | 123 |
| Tazewell | 16,083 | 13,021 | 15,504 | 14,251 | 12,743 | 11,443 | 130 | 235 | 189 | 69 | 47 | 72 |

## VOTE FOR TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—NOVEMBER 5, 1974—Concluded

| Counties | Democratic | | | Republican | | | Socialist Workers Party | | | Communist Party | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Nina T. Shepherd | Arthur R. Velasquez | Robert J. Lenz | Timothy W. Swain | Russell W. Steger | Gardner W. Heidrick | Antonio DeLeon | Mary R. Wismer | Brian Williams | John R. Lumpkin | Jay Schaffner | Valarie Witzkowski |
| Union | 3,295 | 3,140 | 3,285 | 2,060 | 1,969 | 1,928 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vermilion | 14,010 | 12,408 | 13,079 | 12,214 | 11,983 | 11,428 | 154 | 221 | 244 | 115 | 100 | 113 |
| Wabash | 2,594 | 2,197 | 2,338 | 1,999 | 1,939 | 1,915 | 9 | 18 | 22 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Warren | 2,597 | 2,370 | 2,516 | 3,722 | 3,755 | 3,646 | 14 | 16 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Washington | 2,326 | 2,220 | 2,258 | 3,065 | 2,982 | 2,960 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Wayne | 3,047 | 2,800 | 2,900 | 3,566 | 3,591 | 3,615 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| White | 4,237 | 3,991 | 4,140 | 3,276 | 3,276 | 3,197 | 16 | 22 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 10 |
| Whiteside | 6,201 | 5,824 | 6,009 | 8,259 | 8,444 | 8,190 | 49 | 67 | 74 | 29 | 33 | 35 |
| Will | 32,671 | 28,833 | 30,606 | 25,396 | 25,271 | 22,935 | 475 | 660 | 514 | 161 | 140 | 230 |
| Williamson | 9,017 | 8,500 | 8,809 | 6,909 | 6,903 | 6,738 | 56 | 56 | 59 | 33 | 38 | 37 |
| Winnebago | 32,037 | 28,044 | 30,314 | 28,203 | 26,357 | 25,025 | 553 | 874 | 627 | 243 | 254 | 304 |
| Woodford | 2,883 | 2,570 | 2,941 | 4,691 | 4,301 | 4,100 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 1,535,875 | 1,378,577 | 1,409,944 | 1,151,284 | 1,107,032 | 1,042,875 | 34,165 | 50,752 | 34,376 | 17,256 | 17,099 | 27,006 |
| Downstate | 757,073 | 662,782 | 709,944 | 701,094 | 683,070 | 640,904 | 11,142 | 18,952 | 12,107 | 5,852 | 6,103 | 9,358 |
| Cook County | 778,802 | 715,795 | 700,000 | 450,190 | 423,962 | 401,971 | 23,023 | 31,800 | 22,269 | 11,404 | 10,996 | 17,648 |

# APPENDIX E

## ILLINOIS GENERAL ELECTION

## NOVEMBER 7, 1972

### SUMMARY OF GENERAL VOTE

| Office, Party and Candidate | | Plurality | Total in State | Outside Cook County | Cook County | Counties Carried |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS** | | | | | | |
| President and Vice-President | | | | | | |
| Republican | Richard M. Nixon<br>Spiro T. Agnew | 874,707 | 2,788,179 | 1,553,872 | 1,234,307 | 101 |
| Democratic | George McGovern<br>R. Sargent Shriver | | 1,913,472 | 850,204 | 1,063,268 | 1 |
| Socialist Labor | Louis Fisher<br>Genevieve Gunderson | | 12,344 | 5,016 | 7,328 | |
| Communist Party | Gus Hall<br>Jarvis Tyner | | 4,541 | 1,419 | 3,122 | |
| Write-ins: | | | | | | |
| President | John G. Schmitz | | 2,471 | 1,230 | 1,241 | |
| Vice-President | Thomas J. Anderson | | 1,026 | 767 | 259 | |
| Other Write-ins | | | | | | |
| President & Vice-President | | | 348 | 348 | | |
| President | | | 1,881 | 110 | 1,771 | |
| Vice-President | | | 311 | 93 | 218 | |
| **UNITED STATES SENATOR** | | | | | | |
| Republican | Charles H. Percy | 1,146,047 | 2,867,078 | 1,572,507 | 1,294,571 | 102 |
| Democratic | Roman Pucinski | | 1,721,031 | 766,463 | 954,568 | |
| Socialist Labor | Edward C. Gross | | 13,384 | 5,659 | 7,725 | |
| Communist Party | Arnold F. Becchetti | | 6,103 | 2,462 | 3,641 | |
| Write-in | Dakin Williams | | 396 | 258 | 138 | |
| Other Write-ins | | | 388 | 66 | 322 | |
| **GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR** | | | | | | |
| Republican | Richard B. Ogilvie<br>James D. Nowlan | | 2,293,809 | 1,214,774 | 1,079,035 | 47 |
| Democratic | Daniel Walker<br>Neil F. Hartigan | 77,494 | 2,371,303 | 1,192,857 | 1,178,446 | 55 |
| Socialist Labor | George A. LaForest<br>Stanley L. Prorok | | 7,966 | 2,709 | 5,257 | |
| Communist Party | Ishmael Flory<br>Theodore Pearson | | 4,592 | 1,361 | 3,231 | |
| Write-ins | | | | | | |
| Governor | | | 1,035 | 447 | 588 | |
| Lieutenant Governor | | | 239 | 180 | 59 | |
| Other Write-ins | | | | | | |
| Governor & Lieutenant Governor | | | 99 | 99 | | |
| **ATTORNEY GENERAL** | | | | | | |
| Republican | William J. Scott | 1,285,095 | 2,898,198 | 1,548,039 | 1,350,159 | 98 |
| Democratic | Thomas G. Lyons | | 1,613,103 | 782,931 | 830,172 | 4 |
| Socialist Labor | George P. Milonas | | 10,509 | 4,448 | 6,061 | |
| Communist Party | Linda R. Appelhans | | 6,624 | 2,531 | 4,093 | |
| Write-ins | | | 402 | 181 | 221 | |

COPY

## SUMMARY OF GENERAL VOTE—Concluded

| Office, Party and Candidate | | Plurality | Total in State | Outside Cook County | Cook County | Counties Carried |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SECRETARY OF STATE** | | | | | | |
| Republican | Edmund J. Kucharski | | 2,187,544 | 1,175,789 | 1,011,755 | 48 |
| Democratic | Michael J. Howlett | 172,783 | 2,360,327 | 1,174,387 | 1,185,940 | 54 |
| Socialist Labor | Elizabeth Schnur | | 12,419 | 5,877 | 6,542 | |
| Communist Party | Frances Gabow | | 6,079 | 1,958 | 4,121 | |
| Write-Ins | | | 281 | 133 | 148 | |
| **COMPTROLLER** | | | | | | |
| Republican | George W. Lindberg | 122,642 | 2,217,440 | 1,222,143 | 995,297 | 60 |
| Democratic | Dean Barringer | | 2,094,798 | 1,024,515 | 1,070,283 | 42 |
| Socialist Labor | Clarys L. Essex | | 12,797 | 6,061 | 6,736 | |
| Communist Party | Nathan Sharpe | | 9,325 | 3,525 | 5,800 | |
| Write-ins | | | 287 | 164 | 123 | |
| **TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS** | | | | | | |
| Republican | Ralph C. Hahn | | 2,204,218 | 1,244,229 | 959,989 | |
| | Jane S. Hayes Rader | | 2,199,006 | 1,225,689 | 973,317 | |
| | Park Livingston | | 2,168,248 | 1,202,796 | 965,452 | |
| Democratic | Ellen Augustyn | | 2,014,589 | 939,574 | 1,075,015 | |
| | Nicholas J. Bosen | | 1,974,000 | 911,395 | 1,062,605 | |
| | Roger B. Pogue | | 1,938,476 | 916,428 | 1,022,048 | |
| Socialist Labor | Edwin L. Williams | | 28,855 | 17,618 | 11,237 | |
| | Gregory P. Lyngas | | 19,838 | 10,965 | 8,873 | |
| | Henry Schilling | | 23,168 | 13,328 | 9,840 | |
| Communist Party | Jack Kling | | 15,880 | 8,736 | 7,144 | |
| | John Robert Lumpkin | | 17,865 | 10,026 | 7,839 | |
| | William R. Fugate | | 15,699 | 8,832 | 6,867 | |
| Write-ins | | | 533 | 279 | 254 | |
| Total Vote | | | 4,880,213 | 2,498,888 | 2,381,325 | |
| Presidential Elector Ballot | | | 2,652 | 900 | 1,752 | |
| Combined Total | | | 4,882,865 | 2,499,788 | 2,383,077 | |

## VOTE FOR GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR—NOVEMBER 7, 1972

| Counties | Plurality | | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | Write-Ins | Write-Ins | Other Write-Ins |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Richard B. Ogilvie and James D. Nowlan | Per Cent | Daniel Walker and Neil F. Hartigan | Per Cent | George A. LaForest and Stanley L. Prorok | Per Cent | Ishmael Flory and Theodore Pearson | Per Cent | Governor | Lieutenant Governor | Governor and Lt. Governor |
| Adams | R | 3,640 | 16,878 | 56.0 | 13,238 | 43.9 | 32 | .1 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| Alexander | D | 392 | 2,871 | 46.5 | 3,263 | 52.8 | 36 | .6 | 8 | .1 | | | |
| Bond | R | 143 | 3,677 | 51.0 | 3,534 | 49.0 | 2 | .0 | | | | | |
| Boone | R | 435 | 5,292 | 52.0 | 4,857 | 47.8 | 20 | .2 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Brown | D | 336 | 1,348 | 44.1 | 1,684 | 55.1 | 23 | .8 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Bureau | R | 364 | 9,599 | 50.9 | 9,235 | 49.0 | 10 | .0 | | | | | 2 |
| Calhoun | D | 401 | 1,301 | 43.2 | 1,702 | 56.5 | 8 | .3 | | | | | 2 |
| Carroll | R | 1,150 | 4,907 | 56.5 | 3,757 | 43.3 | 14 | .2 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Cass | D | 571 | 3,345 | 46.0 | 3,916 | 53.9 | 2 | .0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Champaign | R | 5,762 | 31,980 | 54.7 | 26,218 | 44.9 | 128 | .2 | 95 | .2 | 69 | 31 | |
| Christian | D | 3,430 | 7,222 | 40.3 | 10,652 | 59.5 | 25 | .1 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Clark | D | 201 | 4,291 | 48.8 | 4,492 | 51.1 | 5 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Clay | D | 448 | 3,851 | 47.2 | 4,299 | 52.7 | 2 | .0 | 4 | .0 | | | |
| Clinton | D | 1,901 | 5,354 | 42.4 | 7,255 | 57.5 | 8 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Coles | D | 1,541 | 10,160 | 46.4 | 11,701 | 53.5 | 10 | .0 | 4 | .0 | | | |
| Cook | (See below) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crawford | D | 1,024 | 4,567 | 44.9 | 5,591 | 55.0 | 5 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Cumberland | D | 624 | 2,376 | 44.2 | 3,000 | 55.8 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | 3 |
| De Kalb | D | 1,660 | 14,792 | 47.2 | 16,452 | 52.6 | 43 | .1 | 19 | .0 | 19 | 7 | |
| De Witt | D | 13 | 3,877 | 49.9 | 3,890 | 50.1 | 1 | .0 | | | | | |
| Douglas | R | 526 | 4,530 | 53.0 | 4,004 | 46.9 | 5 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| DuPage | R | 55,749 | 142,805 | 62.1 | 87,056 | 37.8 | 120 | .0 | 37 | .0 | | | |
| Edgar | R | 487 | 5,826 | 52.1 | 5,339 | 47.7 | 19 | .2 | 4 | .0 | | | |
| Edwards | R | 739 | 2,415 | 58.9 | 1,676 | 40.9 | 6 | .1 | | | | | |
| Effingham | D | 690 | 6,210 | 47.3 | 6,900 | 52.6 | 5 | .0 | 6 | .0 | | | |
| Fayette | D | 1,102 | 4,849 | 44.9 | 5,951 | 55.1 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Ford | R | 1,952 | 4,769 | 62.8 | 2,817 | 37.1 | 2 | .0 | | | | | |
| Franklin | D | 5,004 | 6,907 | 36.6 | 11,911 | 63.2 | 15 | .0 | 21 | .1 | | | |
| Fulton | D | 1,121 | 9,456 | 47.1 | 10,577 | 52.7 | 44 | .2 | 4 | .0 | | | |
| Gallatin | D | 690 | 1,682 | 41.3 | 2,381 | 58.5 | 3 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Greene | D | 716 | 3,420 | 45.1 | 4,136 | 54.6 | 18 | .2 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Grundy | R | 1,105 | 6,700 | 54.5 | 5,595 | 45.5 | 6 | .0 | | | | | 3 |
| Hamilton | D | 1,022 | 2,171 | 40.4 | 3,193 | 59.5 | 5 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Hancock | R | 125 | 5,667 | 50.5 | 5,542 | 49.4 | 6 | .0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Hardin | D | 170 | 1,474 | 47.2 | 1,644 | 52.7 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Henderson | D | 209 | 2,119 | 47.6 | 2,328 | 52.3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Henry | D | 497 | 11,391 | 48.9 | 11,888 | 51.0 | 8 | 0 | | | | | |
| Iroquois | R | 4,317 | 9,986 | 63.7 | 5,669 | 36.2 | 7 | 0 | 3 | .0 | | | 3 |
| Jackson | D | 5,842 | 9,842 | 38.5 | 15,684 | 61.3 | 38 | .1 | 12 | .0 | | | |
| Jasper | D | 450 | 2,607 | 46.0 | 3,057 | 54.0 | 1 | .0 | | | | | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jefferson | D | 2,802 | 6,586 | 41.2 | 9,388 | 58.7 | 24 | .1 | 3 | .0 | | | 1 |
| Jersey | D | 1,220 | 3,644 | 42.8 | 4,864 | 57.1 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | 10 | | |
| Jo Daviess | R | 881 | 4,983 | 54.8 | 4,102 | 45.1 | 7 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Johnson | R | 594 | 2,385 | 57.0 | 1,791 | 42.8 | 3 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Kane | R | 11,232 | 51,649 | 56.0 | 40,417 | 43.8 | 99 | .1 | 40 | .0 | 43 | | |
| Kankakee | R | 3,073 | 21,555 | 53.8 | 18,482 | 46.1 | 27 | .0 | 6 | .0 | 5 | | |
| Kendall | R | 2,465 | 7,176 | 60.3 | 4,711 | 39.6 | 7 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Knox | R | 902 | 13,750 | 51.6 | 12,848 | 48.2 | 31 | .1 | 9 | .0 | | | 19 |
| Lake | R | 10,924 | 75,057 | 53.8 | 64,133 | 46.0 | 176 | .1 | 53 | .0 | | | |
| LaSalle | D | 6,018 | 23,172 | 44.2 | 29,190 | 55.7 | 32 | .0 | 4 | .0 | | | |
| Lawrence | D | 600 | 3,868 | 46.4 | 4,468 | 53.6 | 6 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | 12 |
| Lee | R | 445 | 7,976 | 51.4 | 7,531 | 48.6 | 3 | .0 | | | | | 8 |
| Livingston | R | 2,851 | 10,581 | 57.8 | 7,730 | 42.2 | 7 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Logan | R | 875 | 7,820 | 52.9 | 6,945 | 47.0 | 7 | .0 | | | | | |
| McDonough | R | 1,363 | 8,581 | 54.2 | 7,218 | 45.6 | 17 | .1 | 5 | .0 | | | |
| McHenry | R | 11,701 | 29,879 | 62.1 | 18,178 | 37.8 | 42 | .0 | 17 | .0 | | | |
| McLean | R | 5,479 | 25,667 | 55.9 | 20,188 | 44.0 | 34 | .0 | 13 | .0 | | | |
| Macon | D | 1,550 | 24,495 | 48.4 | 26,045 | 51.5 | 50 | .0 | 17 | .0 | | | |
| Macoupin | D | 3,178 | 10,158 | 43.1 | 13,336 | 56.6 | 56 | .2 | 4 | .0 | | | 6 |
| Madison | D | 20,493 | 39,030 | 39.5 | 59,523 | 60.3 | 79 | .0 | 68 | .0 | 85 | 38 | |
| Marion | D | 2,891 | 7,481 | 41.9 | 10,372 | 58.1 | 6 | .0 | 8 | .0 | | | |
| Marshall | R | 523 | 3,563 | 53.9 | 3,040 | 46.0 | 7 | .1 | | | | | |
| Mason | D | 889 | 3,473 | 44.3 | 4,362 | 55.6 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Massac | R | 93 | 3,161 | 50.7 | 3,068 | 49.2 | 6 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Menard | R | 429 | 2,848 | 54.0 | 2,419 | 45.9 | 5 | .0 | | | | | 1 |
| Mercer | D | 991 | 3,982 | 44.5 | 4,973 | 55.5 | 2 | .0 | | | | | |
| Monroe | D | 453 | 4,453 | 47.5 | 4,906 | 52.3 | 8 | .0 | 7 | .0 | | | |
| Montgomery | D | 2,560 | 6,739 | 42.0 | 9,299 | 57.9 | 14 | .0 | | | | | |
| Morgan | R | 667 | 8,719 | 52.0 | 8,052 | 48.0 | 6 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Moultrie | D | 438 | 2,940 | 46.5 | 3,378 | 53.4 | 1 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Ogle | R | 1,883 | 10,130 | 55.1 | 8,247 | 44.8 | 21 | .1 | | | | | |
| Peoria | R | 860 | 39,416 | 50.5 | 38,556 | 49.4 | 60 | .0 | 31 | .0 | 115 | 43 | |
| Perry | D | 1,623 | 4,809 | 42.8 | 6,432 | 57.2 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Piatt | R | 666 | 4,093 | 54.3 | 3,427 | 45.5 | 11 | .1 | | | | | |
| Pike | D | 323 | 4,809 | 48.2 | 5,132 | 51.5 | 30 | .3 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Pope | R | 12 | 1,141 | 50.2 | 1,129 | 49.7 | 2 | .0 | | | | | |
| Pulaski | D | 8 | 2,074 | 49.6 | 2,082 | 49.8 | 17 | .4 | 5 | .1 | | | |
| Putnam | D | 319 | 1,225 | 44.1 | 1,544 | 55.6 | 6 | .2 | | | | | |
| Randolph | D | 1,369 | 7,424 | 45.8 | 8,793 | 54.2 | | | | | | | |
| Richland | D | 940 | 3,624 | 44.2 | 4,564 | 55.7 | 5 | .0 | | | | | 20 |
| Rock Island | D | 15,120 | 27,350 | 39.1 | 42,470 | 60.7 | 101 | .1 | 30 | .0 | | | |
| St. Clair | D | 17,315 | 39,405 | 40.8 | 56,720 | 58.7 | 450 | .5 | 64 | .0 | | | |
| Saline | D | 1,046 | 6,074 | 46.0 | 7,120 | 53.9 | 9 | .0 | 5 | .0 | | | |
| Sangamon | R | 10,313 | 42,952 | 56.3 | 32,639 | 42.7 | 170 | .2 | 591 | .8 | 36 | 11 | |
| Schuyler | R | 30 | 2,297 | 50.3 | 2,267 | 49.6 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Scott | R | 86 | 1,737 | 51.3 | 1,651 | 48.7 | | | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Shelby | D | 1,044 | 5,280 | 45.5 | 6,324 | 54.4 | 8 | .0 | 3 | .0 | | | |
| Stark | R | 995 | 2,272 | 63.8 | 1,277 | 35.9 | 9 | .3 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Stephenson | R | 149 | 10,961 | 50.3 | 9,912 | 49.6 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 0 | | | |
| Tazewell | D | 2,987 | 22,336 | 46.8 | 25,325 | 53.1 | 26 | .0 | 5 | .0 | | | |



POOR QUALITY

COPY

PAGES BOUND VERTICALLY

## VOTE FOR GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR—NOVEMBER 7, 1972—Concluded

| Counties | | Plurality | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | Write-Ins | Write-Ins | Other Write-Ins |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Richard B. Ogilvie and James D. Nowlan | Per Cent | Daniel Walker and Neil F. Hartigan | Per Cent | George A. LaForest and Stanley I. Prorok | Per Cent | Ishmael Flory and Theodore Pearson | Per Cent | Governor | Lieutenant Governor | Governor and Lt. Governor |
| Union | D | 956 | 3,825 | 44.4 | 4,781 | 55.5 | 7 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Vermilion | D | 695 | 19,320 | 49.0 | 20,015 | 50.8 | 32 | .0 | 28 | .0 | | | 15 |
| Wabash | R | 42 | 3,166 | 50.3 | 3,124 | 49.6 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Warren | R | 1,503 | 5,679 | 57.6 | 4,176 | 42.3 | 8 | .0 | | | | | |
| Washington | R | 817 | 4,176 | 55.4 | 3,359 | 44.5 | 7 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Wayne | R | 53 | 4,603 | 50.3 | 4,550 | 49.7 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| White | D | 1,222 | 4,230 | 43.7 | 5,452 | 56.3 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Whiteside | R | 2,170 | 13,704 | 54.2 | 11,534 | 45.6 | 49 | .2 | 5 | .0 | | | |
| Will | R | 2,644 | 50,717 | 51.3 | 48,073 | 48.6 | 85 | .0 | 30 | .0 | 31 | 26 | |
| Williamson | D | 2,204 | 10,562 | 45.2 | 12,766 | 54.7 | 10 | .0 | 7 | 0 | | | |
| Winnebago | D | 11,644 | 40,922 | 43.7 | 52,566 | 56.1 | 102 | .1 | 29 | .0 | 34 | 24 | |
| Woodford | R | 1,665 | 7,476 | 56.2 | 5,811 | 43.7 | 4 | .0 | 3 | .0 | | | |
| Down State | R | 21,917 | 1,214,774 | 50.4 | 1,192,857 | 49.5 | 2,709 | .1 | 1,361 | .0 | 447 | 180 | 99 |
| Cook County | D | 99,411 | 1,079,035 | 47.6 | 1,178,446 | 52.0 | 5,257 | .2 | 3,231 | .1 | 588 | 59 | |
| Total | D | 77,494 | 2,293,809 | 49.0 | 2,371,303 | 50.7 | 7,966 | .2 | 4,592 | .0 | 1,035 | 239 | 99 |

Plurality is computed from the Republican and Democratic votes.
Counties Carried: Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Nowlan, 47; Mr. Walker, Mr. Hartigan, 55.

## VOTE FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL—NOVEMBER 7, 1972

| Counties | | Plurality | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | William J. Scott | Per Cent | Thomas G. Lyons | Per Cent | George P. Milonas | Per Cent | Linda R. Appelhans | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
| Adams | R | 9,625 | 19,374 | 66.3 | 9,749 | 33.4 | 64 | .2 | 27 | .0 | |
| Alexander | R | 388 | 3,048 | 53.1 | 2,660 | 46.3 | 27 | .5 | 9 | .2 | |
| Bond | R | 1,007 | 3,908 | 57.4 | 2,901 | 42.6 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Boone | R | 4,189 | 7,010 | 71.2 | 2,821 | 28.7 | 10 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Brown | R | 321 | 1,603 | 55.2 | 1,282 | 44.1 | 20 | .7 | | | |
| Bureau | R | 6,328 | 12,200 | 67.5 | 5,872 | 32.5 | 8 | .0 | 2 | .0 | 1 |
| Calhoun | D | 160 | 1,331 | 47.0 | 1,491 | 52.7 | 8 | .3 | 1 | .0 | |
| Carroll | R | 3,683 | 6,046 | 71.8 | 2,363 | 28.1 | 11 | .1 | 3 | .0 | |
| Cass | R | 1,401 | 4,174 | 60.1 | 2,773 | 39.9 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Champaign | R | 29,673 | 43,119 | 75.7 | 13,446 | 23.6 | 176 | .3 | 214 | .4 | 7 |
| Christian | R | 1,462 | 9,397 | 54.1 | 7,935 | 45.7 | 23 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Clark | R | 1,879 | 5,131 | 61.2 | 3,252 | 38.8 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Clay | R | 1,281 | 4,516 | 58.2 | 3,235 | 41.7 | 2 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Clinton | R | 1,969 | 6,826 | 58.4 | 4,857 | 41.5 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 1 |
| Coles | R | 6,945 | 14,111 | 66.3 | 7,166 | 33.6 | 17 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Cook | (See below) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crawford | R | 2,082 | 5,888 | 60.7 | 3,806 | 39.2 | 8 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Cumberland | R | 977 | 3,062 | 59.4 | 2,085 | 40.5 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | 3 |
| DeKalb | R | 14,515 | 22,536 | 73.3 | 8,021 | 26.1 | 131 | .4 | 70 | .2 | 1 |
| DeWitt | R | 2,936 | 5,250 | 69.4 | 2,314 | 30.6 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Douglas | R | 3,566 | 5,962 | 71.3 | 2,396 | 28.7 | 1 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| DuPage | R | 146,121 | 185,923 | 82.3 | 39,802 | 17.6 | 145 | .0 | 84 | .0 | |
| Edgar | R | 3,207 | 7,023 | 64.7 | 3,816 | 35.1 | 14 | .1 | 5 | .0 | |
| Edwards | R | 1,552 | 2,678 | 70.3 | 1,126 | 29.6 | 4 | .1 | | | |
| Effingham | R | 3,286 | 7,885 | 63.1 | 4,599 | 36.8 | 7 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Fayette | R | 1,200 | 5,768 | 55.8 | 4,568 | 44.2 | 1 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Ford | R | 4,241 | 5,873 | 78.2 | 1,632 | 21.7 | | | 1 | .0 | |
| Franklin | R | 266 | 9,031 | 50.6 | 8,765 | 49.1 | 39 | .2 | 28 | .2 | |
| Fulton | R | 4,121 | 11,716 | 60.5 | 7,595 | 39.2 | 44 | .2 | 6 | .0 | |
| Gallatin | D | 235 | 1,737 | 46.8 | 1,972 | 53.1 | 3 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Greene | R | 939 | 4,036 | 56.4 | 3,097 | 43.3 | 19 | .3 | 1 | .0 | |
| Grundy | R | 5,429 | 8,668 | 72.7 | 3,239 | 27.2 | 8 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 2 |
| Hamilton | R | 520 | 2,715 | 55.2 | 2,195 | 44.6 | 5 | .1 | 2 | .0 | |
| Hancock | R | 3,680 | 7,238 | 67.0 | 3,558 | 32.9 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Hardin | R | 385 | 1,647 | 56.5 | 1,262 | 43.3 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Henderson | R | 953 | 2,637 | 61.0 | 1,684 | 39.0 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Henry | R | 5,724 | 14,005 | 62.8 | 8,281 | 37.1 | 10 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Iroquois | R | 8,398 | 12,030 | 76.8 | 3,632 | 23.2 | 6 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 4 |
| Jackson | R | 3,470 | 13,984 | 56.3 | 10,514 | 42.3 | 213 | .9 | 123 | .5 | |
| Jasper | R | 637 | 2,977 | 56.0 | 2,340 | 44.0 | 2 | .0 | | | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jefferson | R | 1,295 | 8,271 | 54.1 | 6,976 | 45.7 | 25 | .2 | 4 | .0 | | |
| Jersey | R | 26 | 4,073 | 50.1 | 4,047 | 49.8 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | |
| JoDaviess | R | 2,716 | 5,679 | 65.6 | 2,963 | 34.2 | 9 | .1 | 1 | .0 | | |
| Johnson | R | 1,307 | 2,596 | 66.7 | 1,289 | 33.1 | 3 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Kane | R | 46,804 | 68,482 | 75.7 | 21,678 | 24.0 | 190 | .2 | 106 | .1 | | 33 |
| Kankakee | R | 14,191 | 29,663 | 68.0 | 12,477 | 31.8 | 37 | .0 | 8 | .0 | | |
| Kendall | R | 7,559 | 9,610 | 82.4 | 2,051 | 17.6 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Knox | R | 7,671 | 16,743 | 64.7 | 9,072 | 35.1 | 35 | .1 | 20 | .0 | | 11 |
| Lake | R | 65,195 | 101,092 | 73.4 | 35,897 | 26.1 | 448 | .3 | 207 | .2 | | |
| LaSalle | R | 12,333 | 31,112 | 62.3 | 18,779 | 37.6 | 30 | .0 | 15 | .0 | | |
| Lawrence | R | 1,422 | 4,656 | 58.9 | 3,234 | 40.9 | 7 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Lee | R | 6,072 | 10,515 | 70.3 | 4,443 | 29.7 | 5 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | 10 |
| Livingston | R | 8,835 | 13,345 | 74.7 | 4,510 | 25.3 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Logan | R | 6,398 | 10,314 | 72.4 | 3,916 | 27.5 | 7 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | |
| McDonough | R | 7,001 | 11,195 | 72.5 | 4,194 | 27.2 | 27 | .2 | 17 | .1 | | |
| McHenry | R | 27,904 | 37,624 | 79.3 | 9,720 | 20.5 | 77 | .2 | 45 | .0 | | |
| McLean | R | 22,655 | 33,841 | 75.0 | 11,186 | 24.8 | 77 | .2 | 40 | .0 | | |
| Macon | R | 13,982 | 31,628 | 63.9 | 17,646 | 35.6 | 204 | .4 | 30 | .0 | | |
| Macoupin | R | 698 | 11,599 | 51.4 | 10,901 | 48.3 | 48 | .2 | 6 | .0 | | 2 |
| Madison | D | 1,679 | 45,430 | 49.0 | 47,109 | 50.8 | 134 | .1 | 96 | .1 | | 33 |
| Marion | R | 1,152 | 9,147 | 53.3 | 7,995 | 46.6 | 19 | .1 | 12 | .0 | | |
| Marshall | R | 2,243 | 4,354 | 67.3 | 2,111 | 32.6 | 7 | .1 | | | | |
| Mason | R | 1,585 | 4,595 | 60.5 | 3,000 | 39.5 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Massac | R | 1,956 | 3,869 | 66.9 | 1,913 | 33.1 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Menard | R | 1,999 | 3,565 | 69.4 | 1,566 | 30.5 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Mercer | R | 1,355 | 4,989 | 57.9 | 3,634 | 42.1 | 1 | .0 | | | | |
| Monroe | R | 2,230 | 5,487 | 62.6 | 3,257 | 37.1 | 15 | .2 | 11 | .1 | | |
| Montgomery | R | 558 | 7,952 | 51.8 | 7,394 | 48.1 | 13 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Morgan | R | 5,745 | 11,030 | 67.6 | 5,285 | 32.4 | 10 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Moultrie | R | 1,764 | 3,952 | 64.3 | 2,188 | 35.6 | 1 | .0 | 3 | .0 | | |
| Ogle | R | 9,338 | 13,512 | 76.3 | 4,174 | 23.6 | 21 | .1 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Peoria | R | 23,396 | 49,512 | 65.3 | 26,116 | 34.4 | 123 | .2 | 75 | .0 | | |
| Perry | R | 1,628 | 6,099 | 57.7 | 4,471 | 42.3 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Piatt | R | 3,410 | 5,401 | 73.0 | 1,991 | 26.9 | 10 | .1 | 1 | .0 | | |
| Pike | R | 1,464 | 5,475 | 57.5 | 4,011 | 42.1 | 30 | .3 | 1 | .0 | | |
| Pope | R | 541 | 1,308 | 63.0 | 767 | 36.9 | 2 | .0 | | | | |
| Pulaski | R | 692 | 2,311 | 58.6 | 1,619 | 41.1 | 8 | .2 | 5 | .1 | | |
| Putnam | R | 451 | 1,574 | 58.3 | 1,123 | 41.6 | 3 | .1 | 2 | .0 | | |
| Randolph | R | 1,178 | 8,286 | 53.8 | 7,108 | 46.2 | 5 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | |
| Richland | R | 2,114 | 4,881 | 63.8 | 2,767 | 36.1 | 7 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | 32 |
| Rock Island | R | 1,099 | 34,191 | 50.7 | 33,092 | 49.0 | 126 | .2 | 58 | .0 | | |
| St. Clair | D | 3,104 | 43,057 | 47.9 | 46,161 | 51.4 | 484 | .5 | 104 | .1 | | |
| Saline | R | 1,932 | 7,141 | 57.7 | 5,209 | 42.1 | 10 | .0 | 6 | .0 | | |
| Sangamon | R | 27,908 | 52,414 | 67.1 | 24,506 | 31.4 | 524 | .7 | 706 | .9 | | 1 |
| Schuyler | R | 979 | 2,681 | 61.1 | 1,702 | 38.8 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | | |
| Scott | R | 830 | 1,966 | 63.3 | 1,136 | 36.6 | .... | .... | 2 | 0 | | |
| Shelby | R | 3,022 | 7,121 | 63.4 | 4,099 | 36.5 | 5 | .0 | 4 | 0 | | |
| Stark | R | 1,510 | 2,491 | 71.5 | 981 | 28.2 | 11 | .3 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Stephenson | R | 7,631 | 13,377 | 69.9 | 5,746 | 30.0 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 0 | | |
| Tazewell | R | 13,903 | 30,337 | 64.8 | 16,434 | 35.1 | 44 | 0 | 32 | 0 | | |

## VOTE FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL—NOVEMBER 7, 1972—Concluded

| Counties | | Plurality | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | William J. Scott | Per Cent | Thomas G. Lyons | Per Cent | George P. Milonas | Per Cent | Linda R. Appelhans | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
| Union | R | 1,283 | 4,721 | 57.8 | 3,438 | 42.1 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Vermilion | R | 12,457 | 25,242 | 66.2 | 12,785 | 33.5 | 66 | .2 | 51 | .1 | 5 |
| Wabash | R | 1,515 | 3,726 | 62.7 | 2,211 | 37.2 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Warren | R | 3,788 | 6,723 | 69.5 | 2,935 | 30.4 | 6 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Washington | R | 2,379 | 4,770 | 66.5 | 2,391 | 33.4 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Wayne | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | R | 2,238 | 5,476 | 62.8 | 3,238 | 37.1 | 4 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Whiteside | R | 954 | 5,008 | 55.2 | 4,054 | 44.7 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Will | R | 8,965 | 16,599 | 68.4 | 7,634 | 31.4 | 37 | .2 | 5 | .0 | |
| Williamson | R | 38,244 | 67,551 | 69.6 | 29,307 | 30.2 | 142 | .1 | 71 | .0 | 7 |
| | R | 4,001 | 13,042 | 58.9 | 9,041 | 40.9 | 21 | .0 | 20 | .0 | |
| Winnebago | R | 22,389 | 57,019 | 62.0 | 34,630 | 37.7 | 222 | .2 | 96 | .1 | 26 |
| Woodford | R | 6,030 | 9,551 | 73.0 | 3,521 | 26.9 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Down State | R | 765,108 | 1,548,039 | 66.2 | 782,931 | 33.5 | 4,448 | .2 | 2,531 | .1 | 181 |
| Cook County | R | 519,987 | 1,350,159 | 61.6 | 830,172 | 37.9 | 6,061 | .3 | 4,093 | 2 | 221 |
| Total | R | 1,285,095 | 2,898,198 | 64.0 | 1,613,103 | 35.6 | 10,509 | .2 | 6,624 | 1 | 402 |

Plurality is Computed from the Republican and Democratic Votes.
Counties Carried: Mr. Scott 98. Mr. Lyons 4.



## VOTE FOR SECRETARY OF STATE—NOVEMBER 7, 1972

| | | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Plurality | Paul Powell | Per Cent | Alan J. Dixon | Per Cent | Frank Cieciwa | Per Cent | Gus Hall | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
| Union | R | 1,283 | 4,721 | 57.8 | 3,438 | 42.1 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Vermilion | R | 12,457 | 25,242 | 66.2 | 12,785 | 33.5 | 66 | .2 | 51 | .1 | 5 |
| Wabash | R | 1,515 | 3,726 | 62.7 | 2,211 | 37.2 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Warren | R | 3,788 | 6,723 | 69.5 | 2,935 | 30.4 | 6 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Washington | R | 2,379 | 4,770 | 66.5 | 2,391 | 33.4 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Wayne | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | R | 2,238 | 5,476 | 62.8 | 3,238 | 37.1 | 4 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Whiteside | R | 954 | 5,008 | 55.2 | 4,054 | 44.7 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Will | R | 8,965 | 16,599 | 68.4 | 7,634 | 31.4 | 37 | .2 | 5 | .0 | |
| Williamson | R | 38,244 | 67,551 | 69.6 | 29,307 | 30.2 | 142 | .1 | 71 | .0 | 7 |
| | R | 4,001 | 13,042 | 58.9 | 9,041 | 40.9 | 21 | .0 | 20 | .0 | |
| Winnebago | R | 22,389 | 57,019 | 62.0 | 34,630 | 37.7 | 222 | .2 | 96 | .1 | 26 |
| Woodford | R | 6,030 | 9,551 | 73.0 | 3,521 | 26.9 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Down State | R | 765,108 | 1,548,039 | 66.2 | 782,931 | 33.5 | 4,448 | .2 | 2,531 | .1 | 181 |
| Cook County | R | 519,987 | 1,350,159 | 61.6 | 830,172 | 37.9 | 6,061 | .3 | 4,093 | 2 | 221 |
| Total | R | 1,285,095 | 2,898,198 | 64.0 | 1,613,103 | 35.6 | 10,509 | .2 | 6,624 | 1 | 402 |

Plurality is Computed from the Republican and Democratic Votes.
Counties Carried: Mr. Powell 98. Mr. Dixon 4.

| Counties | | Plurality | Kucharski | Per Cent | Howlett | Per Cent | Schnur | Per Cent | Gabow | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | R | 221 | 14,809 | 50.2 | 14,588 | 49.5 | 68 | .2 | 19 | .0 | |
| Alexander | D | 613 | 2,607 | 44.5 | 3,220 | 54.9 | 27 | .5 | 8 | .1 | |
| Bond | R | 173 | 3,538 | 51.2 | 3,365 | 48.7 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Boone | R | 1,478 | 5,656 | 57.4 | 4,178 | 42.4 | 13 | .1 | 4 | 0 | |
| Brown | D | 545 | 1,188 | 40.4 | 1,733 | 58.9 | 21 | .7 | 1 | .0 | |
| Bureau | R | 348 | 9,305 | 50.9 | 8,957 | 49.0 | 11 | .0 | | | 1 |
| Calhoun | D | 378 | 1,220 | 43.1 | 1,598 | 56.5 | 11 | 4 | | | |
| Carroll | R | 1,852 | 5,158 | 60.8 | 3,306 | 39.0 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 0 | |
| Cass | D | 1,288 | 2,920 | 41.0 | 4,208 | 59.0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Champaign | D | 5,457 | 25,856 | 44.7 | 31,313 | 54.2 | 426 | .7 | 199 | .3 | 6 |
| Christian | D | 3,662 | 6,947 | 39.5 | 10,609 | 60.4 | 22 | .1 | 1 | 0 | |
| Clark | R | 87 | 4,307 | 50.5 | 4,220 | 49.5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Clay | R | 33 | 3,950 | 50.2 | 3,917 | 49.7 | 2 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Clinton | D | 1,118 | 5,479 | 45.3 | 6,597 | 54.6 | 10 | .0 | 1 | .0 | 1 |
| Coles | D | 1,517 | 9,859 | 46.4 | 11,376 | 53.5 | 21 | .0 | 6 | .0 | |
| Cook | (See below) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crawford | D | 584 | 4,645 | 47.0 | 5,229 | 52.9 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Cumberland | D | 710 | 2,230 | 43.1 | 2,940 | 56.8 | 6 | .1 | 2 | .0 | 3 |
| DeKalb | R | 2,124 | 16,107 | 53.1 | 13,983 | 46.1 | 206 | .7 | 58 | .2 | 1 |
| DeWitt | R | 81 | 3,822 | 50.5 | 3,741 | 49.4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Douglas | R | 557 | 4,445 | 53.3 | 3,888 | 46.6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| DuPage | R | 46,222 | 135,915 | 60.2 | 89,693 | 39.7 | 212 | 0 | 76 | 0 | |
| Edgar | R | 464 | 5,671 | 52.0 | 5,207 | 47.8 | 19 | 2 | 3 | 0 | |
| Edwards | R | 1,031 | 2,451 | 63.2 | 1,420 | 36.6 | 5 | .1 | | | |
| Effingham | D | 2,127 | 5,263 | 41.6 | 7,390 | 58.4 | 6 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Fayette | D | 621 | 4,905 | 47.0 | 5,526 | 53.0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Ford | R | 1,568 | 4,541 | 60.4 | 2,973 | 39.6 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Franklin | D | 2,504 | 7,831 | 42.9 | 10,335 | 56.7 | 43 | .2 | 29 | .2 | |
| Fulton | D | 2,616 | 8,411 | 43.2 | 11,027 | 56.6 | 42 | .2 | 5 | .0 | |
| Gallatin | D | 661 | 1,561 | 41.2 | 2,222 | 58.7 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Greene | D | 690 | 3,283 | 45.1 | 3,973 | 54.6 | 17 | .2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Grundy | R | 1,558 | 6,702 | 56.5 | 5,144 | 43.4 | 9 | .0 | 1 | .0 | 2 |
| Hamilton | D | 384 | 2,283 | 46.0 | 2,667 | 53.8 | 4 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Hancock | R | 1,066 | 5,954 | 54.9 | 4,888 | 45.1 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Hardin | R | 98 | 1,519 | 51.6 | 1,421 | 48.3 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Henderson | R | 159 | 2,245 | 51.8 | 2,086 | 48.1 | | | 2 | .0 | |
| Henry | R | 422 | 11,535 | 50.9 | 11,113 | 49.0 | 8 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Iroquois | R | 3,967 | 9,787 | 62.7 | 5,820 | 37.3 | 7 | .0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Jackson | D | 4,007 | 10,255 | 41.3 | 14,262 | 57.4 | 253 | 1.0 | 84 | .3 | |
| Jasper | D | 1,018 | 2,213 | 40.6 | 3,231 | 59.3 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | 2 |
| Jefferson | D | 1,428 | 6,958 | 45.3 | 8,386 | 54.6 | 22 | .1 | 5 | .0 | |
| Jersey | D | 548 | 3,820 | 46.6 | 4,368 | 53.3 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| JoDaviess | R | 1,100 | 4,922 | 56.2 | 3,822 | 43.7 | 9 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Johnson | R | 526 | 2,219 | 56.6 | 1,693 | 43.2 | 5 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Kane | R | 14,740 | 52,821 | 57.8 | 38,081 | 41.7 | 320 | .4 | 96 | .1 | 36 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kendall | R | 3,484 | 7,534 | 65.0 | 4,050 | 34.9 | 10 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Knox | R | 462 | 13,262 | 50.7 | 12,800 | 49.0 | 55 | .2 | 16 | .0 | |
| Lake | R | 20,088 | 78,421 | 57.0 | 58,333 | 42.4 | 572 | .4 | 170 | .1 | |
| LaSalle | D | 6,098 | 22,165 | 43.9 | 28,263 | 56.0 | 44 | .0 | 9 | .0 | |
| Lawrence | D | 364 | 3,880 | 47.7 | 4,244 | 52.2 | 8 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Lee | R | 1,256 | 8,183 | 54.1 | 6,927 | 45.8 | 3 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 9 |
| Livingston | R | 3,232 | 10,551 | 59.0 | 7,319 | 40.9 | 7 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Logan | D | 24 | 7,135 | 49.9 | 7,159 | 50.1 | 5 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| McDonough | R | 943 | 8,181 | 52.9 | 7,238 | 46.8 | 30 | .2 | 17 | .1 | |
| McHenry | R | 11,844 | 29,632 | 62.3 | 17,788 | 37.4 | 132 | .3 | 29 | .0 | |
| McLean | R | 5,517 | 25,358 | 55.9 | 19,841 | 43.7 | 127 | .3 | 47 | .1 | |
| Macon | D | 9,369 | 20,448 | 40.6 | 29,817 | 59.2 | 105 | .2 | 28 | .0 | |
| Macoupin | D | 3,100 | 9,841 | 43.1 | 12,941 | 56.7 | 43 | .2 | 5 | .0 | |
| Madison | D | 16,295 | 38,852 | 41.2 | 55,147 | 58.5 | 140 | .1 | 85 | .0 | |
| Marion | D | 1,924 | 7,798 | 44.4 | 9,722 | 55.4 | 24 | .1 | 11 | .0 | |
| Marshall | D | 154 | 3,174 | 48.8 | 3,328 | 51.1 | 6 | .0 | | | |
| Mason | D | 1,673 | 3,009 | 39.1 | 4,682 | 60.8 | 3 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Massac | R | 972 | 3,396 | 58.3 | 2,424 | 41.6 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Menard | R | 18 | 2,619 | 50.1 | 2,601 | 49.8 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Mercer | D | 808 | 3,986 | 45.4 | 4,794 | 54.6 | 2 | .0 | | | |
| Monroe | R | 421 | 4,698 | 52.3 | 4,277 | 47.6 | 10 | .1 | 6 | .0 | |
| Montgomery | D | 2,772 | 6,385 | 41.0 | 9,157 | 58.9 | 13 | .0 | | | |
| Morgan | D | 1,734 | 7,379 | 44.7 | 9,113 | 55.2 | 8 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Moultrie | D | 453 | 2,824 | 46.2 | 3,277 | 53.7 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Ogle | R | 4,144 | 10,904 | 61.6 | 6,760 | 38.2 | 27 | .2 | 3 | .0 | |
| Peoria | D | 14,992 | 30,999 | 40.1 | 45,991 | 59.5 | 279 | .4 | 74 | .0 | |
| Perry | R | 135 | 5,443 | 50.6 | 5,308 | 49.4 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Piatt | D | 136 | 3,615 | 49.0 | 3,751 | 50.8 | 10 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Pike | D | 145 | 4,664 | 49.1 | 4,809 | 50.6 | 25 | .3 | 2 | .0 | |
| Pope | R | 214 | 1,170 | 54.9 | 956 | 44.9 | 4 | .2 | | | |
| Pulaski | D | 62 | 1,962 | 49.1 | 2,024 | 50.6 | 10 | .3 | 3 | .0 | |
| Putnam | D | 222 | 1,247 | 45.8 | 1,469 | 53.9 | 3 | .1 | 4 | .1 | |
| Randolph | D | 1,291 | 7,180 | 45.9 | 8,471 | 54.1 | 5 | .0 | | | |
| Richland | D | 625 | 3,567 | 45.9 | 4,192 | 54.0 | 7 | .0 | | | 29 |
| Rock Island | D | 12,839 | 27,655 | 40.5 | 40,494 | 59.3 | 123 | .2 | 36 | .0 | |
| St. Clair | D | 16,630 | 37,448 | 40.7 | 54,078 | 58.8 | 406 | .4 | 88 | .0 | |
| Saline | D | 558 | 6,009 | 47.7 | 6,567 | 52.2 | 11 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Sangamon | D | 8,988 | 34,507 | 43.6 | 43,495 | 54.9 | 787 | 1.0 | 371 | .5 | 2 |
| Schuyler | D | 247 | 2,106 | 47.2 | 2,353 | 52.7 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Scott | R | 56 | 1,635 | 50.9 | 1,579 | 49.1 | | | 1 | .0 | |
| Shelby | D | 1,195 | 4,964 | 44.6 | 6,159 | 55.3 | 8 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Stark | R | 265 | 1,880 | 53.6 | 1,615 | 46.1 | 9 | .3 | 1 | .0 | |
| Stephenson | R | 2,417 | 10,745 | 56.3 | 8,328 | 43.6 | 16 | .0 | 9 | .0 | |
| Tazewell | D | 6,410 | 20,325 | 43.1 | 26,735 | 56.7 | 77 | .2 | 17 | .0 | |
| Union | D | 751 | 3,728 | 45.4 | 4,479 | 54.5 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Vermilion | D | 1,921 | 18,495 | 47.4 | 20,416 | 52.3 | 97 | .2 | 47 | .1 | 3 |
| Wabash | R | 415 | 3,219 | 53.4 | 2,804 | 46.5 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Warren | R | 1,185 | 5,528 | 55.9 | 4,343 | 43.9 | 9 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Washington | R | 1,367 | 4,349 | 59.3 | 2,982 | 40.6 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |

## VOTE FOR SECRETARY OF STATE—NOVEMBER 7, 1972—Concluded

| | | Plurality | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Edmund J Kucharski | Per Cent | Michael J. Howlett | Per Cent | Elizabeth Schnur | Per Cent | Frances Gabow | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
| Wayne | R | 989 | 4,921 | 55.5 | 3,932 | 44.4 | 1 | .0 | 4 | 0 | ..... |
| White | D | 283 | 4,434 | 48.4 | 4,717 | 51.5 | 2 | .0 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Whiteside | R | 1,760 | 13,089 | 53.5 | 11,329 | 46.3 | 43 | .2 | 3 | 0 | ..... |
| Will | R | 5,189 | 51,343 | 52.5 | 46,154 | 47.2 | 256 | .3 | 79 | 0 | 8 |
| Williamson | D | 787 | 10,806 | 48.2 | 11,593 | 51.7 | 24 | .1 | 14 | 0 | ..... |
| Winnebago | D | 3,939 | 43,753 | 47.6 | 47,692 | 51.9 | 355 | .4 | 88 | 0 | 26 |
| Woodford | R | 913 | 6,956 | 53.5 | 6,043 | 46.5 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | ..... |
| Down State | R | 1,402 | 1,175,789 | 49.9 | 1,174,387 | 49.8 | 5,877 | .2 | 1,958 | .0 | 133 |
| Cook County | D | 174,185 | 1,011,755 | 45.8 | 1,185,940 | 53.7 | 6,542 | .3 | 4,121 | .2 | 148 |
| Total | D | 172,783 | 2,187,544 | 47.9 | 2,360,327 | 51.7 | 12,419 | .3 | 6,079 | .1 | 281 |

Plurality is computed from the Republican and Democratic Votes.
Counties Carried, Mr. Kucharski, 48; Mr. Howlett 54.

## VOTE FOR COMPTROLLER—NOVEMBER 7, 1972

| Counties | | Plurality | Republican George W. Lindberg | Per Cent | Democratic Dean Barringer | Per Cent | Socialist Labor Clarys L. Essex | Per Cent | Communist Nathan Sharpe | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | R | 963 | 14,580 | 51.5 | 13,617 | 48.1 | 64 | .2 | 73 | .3 | |
| Alexander | D | 957 | 2,368 | 41.3 | 3,325 | 58.0 | 31 | .5 | 8 | .1 | |
| Bond | R | 359 | 3,463 | 52.7 | 3,104 | 47.3 | 1 | .0 | | | |
| Boone | R | 2,060 | 5,765 | 60.7 | 3,705 | 39.0 | 19 | .2 | 3 | .0 | |
| Brown | D | 344 | 1,201 | 43.4 | 1,545 | 55.8 | 21 | .8 | | | |
| Bureau | R | 3,007 | 10,099 | 58.7 | 7,092 | 41.2 | 7 | .0 | 2 | .0 | 1 |
| Calhoun | D | 175 | 1,214 | 46.4 | 1,389 | 53.1 | 10 | .4 | 1 | .0 | |
| Carroll | R | 2,118 | 5,150 | 62.8 | 3,032 | 37.0 | 14 | .2 | 3 | .0 | |
| Cass | D | 573 | 3,080 | 45.7 | 3,653 | 54.2 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Champaign | R | 565 | 27,607 | 49.8 | 27,042 | 48.8 | 436 | .8 | 310 | .6 | 5 |
| Christian | D | 2,819 | 6,875 | 41.4 | 9,694 | 58.4 | 19 | .1 | 2 | .0 | |
| Clark | R | 286 | 4,271 | 51.7 | 3,985 | 48.2 | 4 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Clay | R | 141 | 3,853 | 50.9 | 3,712 | 49.0 | 2 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Clinton | D | 297 | 5,455 | 48.6 | 5,752 | 51.3 | 5 | .0 | 2 | .0 | 2 |
| Coles | D | 751 | 9,769 | 48.1 | 10,520 | 51.8 | 24 | .1 | 7 | .0 | |
| Cook | (See below) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crawford | R | 484 | 4,990 | 52.5 | 4,506 | 47.4 | 6 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Cumberland | D | 252 | 2,337 | 47.4 | 2,589 | 52.5 | 3 | .0 | | | 3 |
| DeKalb | R | 3,179 | 15,878 | 54.8 | 12,699 | 43.8 | 262 | .9 | 152 | .5 | |
| DeWitt | R | 503 | 3,877 | 53.4 | 3,374 | 46.5 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Douglas | R | 1,435 | 4,707 | 58.9 | 3,272 | 41.0 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| DuPage | R | 85,266 | 150,482 | 69.7 | 65,216 | 30.2 | 225 | .1 | 84 | .0 | |
| Edgar | R | 1,255 | 5,878 | 55.9 | 4,623 | 43.9 | 15 | .1 | 4 | .0 | |
| Edwards | R | 1,268 | 2,477 | 67.1 | 1,209 | 32.8 | 4 | .1 | | | |
| Effingham | D | 743 | 5,457 | 46.8 | 6,200 | 53.1 | 9 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Fayette | D | 121 | 4,934 | 49.4 | 5,055 | 50.6 | 1 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Ford | R | 2,304 | 4,777 | 65.9 | 2,473 | 34.1 | 2 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Franklin | D | 3,877 | 6,802 | 38.7 | 10,679 | 60.8 | 39 | .2 | 52 | .3 | |
| Fulton | D | 117 | 9,136 | 49.5 | 9,253 | 50.2 | 55 | .3 | 5 | .0 | |
| Gallatin | D | 626 | 1,479 | 41.2 | 2,105 | 58.7 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Greene | D | 261 | 3,323 | 48.0 | 3,584 | 51.7 | 19 | .3 | 3 | .0 | |
| Grundy | R | 2,456 | 6,806 | 60.9 | 4,350 | 39.0 | 10 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Hamilton | D | 316 | 2,148 | 46.5 | 2,464 | 53.3 | 5 | .1 | 3 | .0 | |
| Hancock | R | 1,769 | 6,098 | 58.4 | 4,329 | 41.5 | 5 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| Hardin | R | 148 | 1,485 | 52.6 | 1,337 | 47.3 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Henderson | R | 329 | 2,283 | 53.9 | 1,954 | 46.1 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Henry | R | 2,320 | 12,017 | 55.3 | 9,697 | 44.6 | 8 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Iroquois | R | 6,002 | 10,556 | 69.8 | 4,554 | 30.1 | 5 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 5 |
| Jackson | D | 5,176 | 9,179 | 38.2 | 14,355 | 59.8 | 298 | 1.2 | 168 | .7 | |
| Jasper | D | 607 | 2,298 | 44.2 | 2,905 | 55.8 | | | | | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jefferson | D | 1,643 | 6,539 | 44.6 | 8,082 | 55.1 | 27 | .2 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| Jersey | D | 395 | 3,692 | 47.4 | 4,087 | 52.5 | 1 | .0 | 1 | 0 | |
| JoDaviess | R | 1,632 | 5,004 | 59.7 | 3,372 | 40.2 | 9 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Johnson | R | 447 | 2,092 | 55.9 | 1,645 | 43.9 | 4 | .1 | 2 | 0 | |
| Kane | R | 24,670 | 56,147 | 63.6 | 31,477 | 35.7 | 386 | .4 | 262 | .3 | 28 |
| Kankakee | R | 6,217 | 21,798 | 58.3 | 15,581 | 41.6 | 27 | .0 | 15 | .0 | |
| Kendall | R | 4,732 | 7,892 | 71.3 | 3,160 | 28.6 | 11 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Knox | R | 3,173 | 14,011 | 56.2 | 10,838 | 43.4 | 63 | .3 | 35 | .1 | |
| Lake | R | 31,318 | 82,035 | 61.4 | 50,717 | 37.9 | 605 | .5 | 339 | .3 | |
| LaSalle | D | 207 | 22,990 | 49.7 | 23,197 | 50.2 | 45 | .0 | 12 | .0 | |
| Lawrence | R | 185 | 4,006 | 51.1 | 3,821 | 48.8 | 6 | 0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Lee | R | 2,719 | 8,538 | 59.4 | 5,819 | 40.5 | 4 | .0 | 3 | .0 | 8 |
| Livingston | R | 5,071 | 11,053 | 64.8 | 5,982 | 35.1 | 6 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Logan | R | 1,300 | 7,399 | 54.8 | 6,099 | 45.2 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | |
| McDonough | R | 2,617 | 8,694 | 58.6 | 6,077 | 41.0 | 37 | .2 | 21 | .1 | |
| McHenry | R | 21,427 | 33,905 | 72.8 | 12,478 | 26.8 | 142 | .3 | 75 | .2 | |
| McLean | R | 3,266 | 23,449 | 53.5 | 20,183 | 46.0 | 154 | .4 | 77 | .2 | |
| Macon | D | 5,990 | 21,036 | 43.6 | 27,026 | 56.0 | 120 | .2 | 53 | .1 | |
| Macoupin | D | 2,022 | 9,799 | 45.2 | 11,821 | 54.6 | 37 | .2 | 11 | .0 | |
| Madison | D | 12,627 | 37,579 | 42.7 | 50,206 | 57.0 | 147 | .2 | 111 | .1 | 22 |
| Marion | D | 1,645 | 7,548 | 44.9 | 9,193 | 54.7 | 37 | .2 | 26 | .2 | |
| Marshall | R | 890 | 3,551 | 57.1 | 2,661 | 42.8 | 7 | .1 | | | |
| Mason | D | 584 | 3,363 | 46.0 | 3,947 | 54.0 | 3 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Massac | R | 834 | 3,190 | 57.5 | 2,356 | 42.4 | 1 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Menard | R | 726 | 2,848 | 57.2 | 2,122 | 42.6 | 3 | .0 | 4 | .0 | |
| Mercer | D | 6 | 4,213 | 50.0 | 4,219 | 50.0 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Monroe | R | 734 | 4,624 | 54.1 | 3,890 | 45.6 | 18 | .2 | 8 | .0 | |
| Montgomery | D | 1,412 | 6,668 | 45.2 | 8,081 | 54.7 | 18 | .1 | 1 | .0 | |
| Morgan | R | 347 | 8,003 | 51.1 | 7,656 | 48.8 | 12 | .0 | 3 | .0 | |
| Moultrie | D | 97 | 2,850 | 49.1 | 2,947 | 50.8 | 1 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Ogle | R | 5,130 | 10,943 | 65.2 | 5,813 | 34.6 | 19 | .1 | 3 | .0 | |
| Peoria | R | 4,316 | 38,857 | 52.6 | 34,541 | 46.8 | 263 | .4 | 223 | .3 | |
| Perry | D | 342 | 4,933 | 48.3 | 5,275 | 51.6 | 7 | .0 | 1 | .0 | |
| Piatt | R | 757 | 3,909 | 55.3 | 3,152 | 44.6 | 10 | .1 | | | |
| Pike | D | 60 | 4,522 | 49.5 | 4,582 | 50.2 | 28 | .3 | 1 | .0 | |
| Pope | R | 236 | 1,116 | 55.8 | 880 | 44.0 | 3 | .2 | | | |
| Pulaski | D | 374 | 1,740 | 45.0 | 2,114 | 54.7 | 12 | .3 | 2 | .0 | |
| Putnam | R | 35 | 1,208 | 50.5 | 1,273 | 49.2 | 6 | .2 | 2 | .0 | |
| Randolph | D | 707 | 7,186 | 47.6 | 7,893 | 52.3 | 8 | .0 | | | |
| Richland | R | 410 | 3,891 | 52.7 | 3,481 | 47.2 | 5 | .0 | | | 55 |
| Rock Island | D | 9,745 | 27,817 | 42.4 | 37,562 | 57.3 | 125 | .2 | 89 | .1 | |
| St. Clair | D | 12,691 | 36,750 | 42.4 | 49,441 | 57.0 | 378 | .4 | 138 | .2 | |
| Saline | D | 356 | 5,791 | 48.5 | 6,147 | 51.4 | 9 | .0 | 5 | .0 | |
| Sangamon | R | 1,762 | 37,687 | 50.4 | 35,925 | 48.1 | 634 | .8 | 512 | .7 | 2 |
| Schuyler | R | 183 | 2,234 | 52.1 | 2,051 | 47.8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| Scott | R | 202 | 1,655 | 53.2 | 1,453 | 46.7 | | | 1 | 0 | |
| Shelby | D | 466 | 5,041 | 47.7 | 5,507 | 52.1 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | |
| Stark | R | 951 | 2,156 | 64.0 | 1,205 | 35.8 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Stephenson | R | 2,041 | 10,609 | 55.3 | 8,568 | 44.6 | 13 | 0 | 10 | 0 | |
| Tazewell | D | 1,451 | 21,916 | 48.2 | 23,367 | 51.4 | 94 | 2 | 87 | 2 | |

## VOTE FOR COMPTROLLER—NOVEMBER 7, 1972—Concluded

| Counties | | Plurality | Republican | | Democratic | | Socialist Labor | | Communist | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | George W. Lindberg | Per Cent | Dean Barringer | Per Cent | Clarys L. Essex | Per Cent | Nathan Sharpe | Per Cent | Write-Ins |
| Union | D | 2,109 | 3,008 | 37.0 | 5,117 | 62.9 | 6 | .0 | 4 | .0 | ..... |
| Vermilion | R | 1,796 | 19,691 | 52.1 | 17,895 | 47.4 | 108 | .3 | 72 | .2 | 4 |
| Wabash | R | 644 | 3,182 | 55.6 | 2,538 | 44.3 | 2 | .0 | 2 | .0 | ..... |
| Warren | R | 2,672 | 6,070 | 64.0 | 3,398 | 35.8 | 11 | .1 | 3 | .0 | ..... |
| Washington | R | 1,710 | 4,367 | 62.1 | 2,657 | 37.8 | 6 | .0 | 2 | .0 | ..... |
| Wayne | R | 1,224 | 4,845 | 57.2 | 3,621 | 42.7 | 6 | .0 | 3 | .0 | ..... |
| White | D | 15 | 4,401 | 49.9 | 4,416 | 50.1 | 4 | .0 | 2 | .0 | ..... |
| Whiteside | R | 3,882 | 13,614 | 58.2 | 9,732 | 41.6 | 35 | .1 | 5 | .0 | ..... |
| Will | R | 10,140 | 51,991 | 55.1 | 41,851 | 44.4 | 317 | .3 | 157 | .2 | 5 |
| Williamson | D | 682 | 10,344 | 48.3 | 11,026 | 51.5 | 25 | .1 | 22 | .1 | ..... |
| Winnebago | D | 618 | 44,146 | 49.4 | 44,764 | 50.1 | 323 | .4 | 164 | .2 | 21 |
| Woodford | R | 3,171 | 7,752 | 62.8 | 4,581 | 37.1 | 9 | .0 | 2 | .0 | ..... |
| Down State | R | 197,628 | 1,222,143 | 54.2 | 1,024,515 | 45.4 | 6,061 | .3 | 3,525 | .2 | 164 |
| Cook County | D | 74,986 | 995,297 | 47.9 | 1,070,283 | 51.5 | 6,736 | .3 | 5,800 | .3 | 123 |
| Total | R | 122,642 | 2,217,440 | 51.2 | 2,094,798 | 48.3 | 12,797 | .3 | 9,325 | .2 | 287 |

Plurality is Computed from the Republican and Democratic Votes.
Counties Carried: Mr. Lindberg, 60; Mr. Barringer, 42.

## VOTE FOR TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—NOVEMBER 7, 1972

| Counties | Republican | | | Democratic | | | Socialist Labor | | | Communist Party | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ralph C. Hahn | Jane S. Hayes Rader | Park Livingston | Ellen Augustyn | Nicholas J. Bosen | Roger B. Pogue | Edwin L. Williams | Gregory P. Lyngas | Henry Schilling | Jack Kling | John Robert Lumpkin | William R. Fugate |
| Adams | 15,107 | 14,724 | 14,246 | 11,697 | 11,221 | 11,307 | 408 | 158 | 194 | 165 | 153 | 340 |
| Alexander | 2,703 | 2,720 | 2,680 | 2,665 | 2,633 | 2,651 | 28 | 24 | 28 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| Bond | 3,474 | 3,390 | 3,377 | 2,817 | 2,775 | 2,758 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Boone | 6,157 | 6,004 | 5,989 | 3,229 | 3,169 | 3,119 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 5 | 7 | 5 |
| Brown | 1,228 | 1,212 | 1,232 | 1,422 | 1,419 | 1,410 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Bureau | 10,637 | 10,557 | 10,556 | 6,505 | 6,407 | 6,457 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Calhoun | 1,163 | 1,109 | 1,111 | 1,210 | 1,193 | 1,177 | 11 | 12 | 12 | ..... | ..... | 1 |
| Carroll | 5,382 | 5,351 | 5,323 | 2,687 | 2,639 | 2,673 | 13 | 18 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Cass | 3,182 | 3,088 | 3,076 | 3,040 | 3,038 | 3,042 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Champaign | 29,810 | 29,098 | 28,129 | 21,644 | 21,605 | 25,494 | 1,278 | 714 | 775 | 690 | 2,127 | 663 |
| Christian | 7,009 | 6,998 | 6,835 | 8,481 | 8,336 | 8,554 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Clark | 4,428 | 4,349 | 4,352 | 3,387 | 3,359 | 3,326 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Clay | 3,896 | 3,827 | 3,817 | 3,320 | 3,298 | 3,316 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Clinton | 5,813 | 5,544 | 5,550 | 5,209 | 5,197 | 5,143 | 14 | 11 | 18 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Coles | 10,364 | 10,359 | 10,362 | 9,219 | 8,942 | 9,205 | 51 | 47 | 53 | 33 | 52 | 33 |
| Cook | (See below) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crawford | 5,364 | 5,290 | 5,337 | 4,104 | 4,094 | 4,072 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 5 |
| Cumberland | 2,456 | 2,407 | 2,449 | 2,342 | 2,349 | 2,354 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 3 | ..... |
| DeKalb | 16,058 | 15,773 | 15,472 | 12,088 | 10,967 | 10,324 | 631 | 464 | 476 | 309 | 266 | 228 |
| DeWitt | 4,103 | 4,063 | 4,102 | 2,835 | 2,741 | 2,943 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Douglas | 4,923 | 4,920 | 4,925 | 2,905 | 2,822 | 3,094 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| DuPage | 147,008 | 145,833 | 143,540 | 68,713 | 63,584 | 64,406 | 410 | 395 | 346 | 161 | 184 | 145 |
| Edgar | 6,164 | 6,073 | 6,074 | 4,270 | 4,239 | 4,259 | 28 | 17 | 25 | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| Edwards | 2,410 | 2,373 | 2,371 | 1,114 | 1,110 | 1,094 | 7 | 7 | 7 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Effingham | 5,701 | 5,361 | 5,402 | 5,065 | 4,953 | 4,967 | 22 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 17 | 9 |
| Fayette | 5,060 | 4,949 | 4,974 | 4,744 | 4,679 | 4,719 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| Ford | 5,007 | 4,980 | 4,967 | 2,116 | 2,103 | 2,225 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Franklin | 6,726 | 6,992 | 6,557 | 9,471 | 9,277 | 9,166 | 153 | 66 | 91 | 63 | 69 | 68 |
| Fulton | 9,395 | 9,265 | 9,388 | 8,677 | 8,563 | 8,684 | 53 | 51 | 55 | 10 | 12 | 12 |
| Gallatin | 1,546 | 1,550 | 1,546 | 2,038 | 2,022 | 2,029 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Greene | 3,373 | 3,312 | 3,336 | 2,993 | 2,949 | 2,914 | 22 | 20 | 21 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| Grundy | 6,953 | 6,859 | 6,895 | 4,095 | 4,103 | 4,027 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Hamilton | 2,085 | 2,049 | 2,067 | 2,133 | 2,089 | 2,050 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Hancock | 6,142 | 6,078 | 6,098 | 3,755 | 3,675 | 3,768 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Hardin | 1,516 | 1,505 | 1,508 | 1,295 | 1,295 | 1,293 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Henderson | 2,331 | 2,331 | 2,295 | 1,833 | 1,790 | 1,933 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Henry | 12,168 | 12,120 | 12,046 | 8,710 | 8,454 | 8,504 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Iroquois | 10,431 | 10,263 | 10,241 | 4,179 | 4,150 | 4,159 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Jackson | 10,016 | 10,839 | 8,930 | 12,423 | 11,616 | 11,906 | 720 | 529 | 501 | 332 | 325 | 244 |
| Jasper | 2,496 | 2,443 | 2,456 | 2,581 | 2,548 | 2,572 | 3 | ..... | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Jefferson | 6,485 | 6,507 | 6,385 | 7,035 | 6,911 | 6,991 | 35 | 28 | 27 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| Jersey | 3,670 | 3,588 | 3,564 | 3,685 | 3,599 | 3,679 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| JoDaviess | 4,947 | 4,867 | 4,837 | 3,035 | 2,972 | 2,933 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Johnson | 2,227 | 2,270 | 2,196 | 1,350 | 1,316 | 1,356 | 5 | 4 | 5 | ..... | 1 | 2 |
| Kane | 55,148 | 52,749 | 51,859 | 31,466 | 29,876 | 27,861 | 1,384 | 682 | 979 | 710 | 597 | 626 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kankakee | 22,276 | 21,910 | 21,910 | 15,305 | 15,157 | 15,090 | 59 | 40 | 46 | 12 | 17 | 9 |
| Kendall | 7,700 | 7,515 | 7,442 | 2,735 | 2,637 | 2,660 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| Knox | 13,749 | 13,662 | 13,330 | 9,482 | 8,840 | 9,764 | 204 | 109 | 114 | 129 | 105 | 124 |
| Lake | 75,675 | 76,847 | 73,598 | 53,380 | 49,545 | 46,226 | 2,084 | 1,305 | 1,538 | 1,006 | 898 | 880 |
| LaSalle | 24,277 | 23,982 | 23,895 | 22,156 | 21,679 | 21,672 | 62 | 50 | 51 | 23 | 26 | 19 |
| Lawrence | 4,097 | 4,071 | 4,015 | 3,416 | 3,331 | 3,309 | 15 | 11 | 16 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Lee | 8,552 | 8,343 | 8,284 | 4,858 | 4,798 | 4,931 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| Livingston | 11,081 | 10,888 | 10,975 | 5,153 | 4,988 | 4,697 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Logan | 8,370 | 8,120 | 8,052 | 4,621 | 4,632 | 4,756 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 1 | 2 | ..... |
| Macon | 21,196 | 21,840 | 19,190 | 22,587 | 21,813 | 29,385 | 411 | 205 | 219 | 118 | 168 | 117 |
| Macoupin | 10,235 | 10,121 | 10,025 | 11,040 | 10,932 | 11,003 | 50 | 41 | 44 | 13 | 11 | 13 |
| Madison | 38,977 | 39,275 | 38,174 | 49,340 | 48,733 | 48,775 | 330 | 283 | 319 | 207 | 191 | 174 |
| Marion | 7,826 | 7,685 | 7,459 | 8,460 | 8,315 | 8,155 | 130 | 59 | 78 | 65 | 62 | 56 |
| Marshall | 3,710 | 3,678 | 3,720 | 2,431 | 2,392 | 2,423 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Mason | 3,604 | 3,537 | 3,586 | 3,452 | 3,420 | 3,486 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Massac | 3,335 | 3,306 | 3,302 | 2,020 | 2,001 | 2,022 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| McDonough | 8,559 | 8,580 | 8,360 | 5,299 | 5,002 | 5,482 | 162 | 137 | 177 | 121 | 95 | 187 |
| McHenry | 31,229 | 29,536 | 29,036 | 14,615 | 13,860 | 12,436 | 724 | 370 | 512 | 307 | 218 | 234 |
| McLean | 25,886 | 25,720 | 25,140 | 15,357 | 14,902 | 14,447 | 719 | 390 | 489 | 392 | 382 | 439 |
| Menard | 3,001 | 2,939 | 2,968 | 1,816 | 1,817 | 1,797 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Mercer | 4,453 | 4,482 | 4,421 | 3,763 | 3,719 | 3,777 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Monroe | 4,863 | 4,751 | 4,727 | 3,577 | 3,563 | 3,563 | 38 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 16 | 17 |
| Montgomery | 6,876 | 6,896 | 6,911 | 7,528 | 7,496 | 7,493 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Morgan | 8,451 | 8,138 | 8,224 | 5,940 | 5,810 | 5,751 | 18 | 13 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Moultrie | 2,938 | 2,935 | 2,901 | 2,690 | 2,624 | 2,904 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Ogle | 10,989 | 10,914 | 10,623 | 4,740 | 4,332 | 4,513 | 37 | 30 | 28 | 8 | 11 | 10 |
| Peoria | 40,042 | 38,144 | 39,016 | 29,801 | 29,259 | 28,379 | 1,187 | 547 | 774 | 646 | 653 | 841 |
| Perry | 4,783 | 5,633 | 4,560 | 4,353 | 4,148 | 4,315 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Piatt | 4,298 | 4,239 | 4,294 | 2,666 | 2,591 | 3,006 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Pike | 4,628 | 4,586 | 4,618 | 4,295 | 4,282 | 4,266 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Pope | 1,155 | 1,167 | 1,152 | 806 | 785 | 800 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Pulaski | 1,926 | 1,932 | 1,870 | 1,625 | 1,598 | 1,585 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Putnam | 1,391 | 1,363 | 1,367 | 1,160 | 1,166 | 1,161 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Randolph | 7,434 | 7,256 | 7,146 | 7,421 | 7,292 | 7,514 | 20 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Richland | 4,288 | 4,121 | 4,153 | 2,989 | 3,032 | 2,996 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 1 | ..... | ..... |
| Rock Island | 29,546 | 29,692 | 29,427 | 34,459 | 34,119 | 34,210 | 299 | 269 | 336 | 161 | 174 | 171 |
| Saline | 5,963 | 6,009 | 5,962 | 5,759 | 5,673 | 5,748 | 23 | 19 | 20 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Sangamon | 41,938 | 38,633 | 38,505 | 27,566 | 28,435 | 27,305 | 1,557 | 1,019 | 1,252 | 1,131 | 1,174 | 1,319 |
| Schuyler | 2,349 | 2,313 | 2,308 | 1,878 | 1,864 | 1,908 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Scott | 1,718 | 1,649 | 1,665 | 1,124 | 1,144 | 1,125 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Shelby | 5,260 | 5,291 | 5,187 | 4,952 | 4,858 | 5,344 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 5 |
| Stark | 2,185 | 2,192 | 2,193 | 1,118 | 1,088 | 1,102 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| St. Clair | 37,423 | 38,312 | 37,061 | 47,346 | 46,776 | 47,377 | 576 | 511 | 589 | 161 | 165 | 172 |
| Stephenson | 11,492 | 11,455 | 11,312 | 6,492 | 6,295 | 6,377 | 31 | 24 | 27 | 15 | 20 | 13 |
| Tazewell | 22,799 | 22,515 | 22,097 | 20,773 | 19,839 | 19,937 | 543 | 262 | 582 | 265 | 271 | 360 |
| Union | 3,600 | 4,607 | 3,518 | 3,431 | 3,310 | 3,465 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Vermilion | 20,280 | 19,061 | 19,140 | 17,713 | 15,516 | 15,292 | 391 | 230 | 242 | 199 | 461 | 239 |
| Wabash | 3,297 | 3,289 | 3,244 | 2,386 | 2,361 | 2,351 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Warren | 6,098 | 6,107 | 6,076 | 3,218 | 3,087 | 3,302 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| Washington | 4,435 | 4,350 | 4,260 | 2,506 | 2,541 | 2,530 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

R COPY

## VOTE FOR TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS—
## NOVEMBER 7, 1972—Concluded

| Counties | Republican | | | Democratic | | | Socialist Labor | | | Communist Party | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ralph C Hahn | Jane S. Haves Rader | Park Livingston | Ellen Augustyn | Nicholas J Bosen | Roger B Pogue | Edwin L Williams | Gregory P Lyngas | Henry Schilling | Jack Kling | John Robert Lumpkin | William R Fugate |
| Wayne | 4.841 | 4.779 | 4.727 | 3.253 | 3.202 | 3.183 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| White | 4.396 | 4.346 | 4.350 | 4.094 | 4.055 | 4.054 | 5 | 3 | 4 | ..... | 3 | ..... |
| Whiteside | 14.293 | 14.043 | 13.979 | 8.551 | 8.519 | 8.454 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 10 | 11 | 6 |
| Will | 52.889 | 50.030 | 48.829 | 40.888 | 40.371 | 37.691 | 885 | 538 | 730 | 266 | 254 | 194 |
| Williamson | 10.993 | 11.157 | 10.698 | 10.180 | 10.047 | 10.167 | 89 | 65 | 73 | 42 | 41 | 44 |
| Winnebago | 46.308 | 43.988 | 43.410 | 39.471 | 37.950 | 37.231 | 1.248 | 648 | 856 | 740 | 546 | 646 |
| Woodford | 8.014 | 7.820 | 7.852 | 3.867 | 3.777 | 3.822 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Down State | 1.244.229 | 1.225.689 | 1.202.796 | 939.574 | 911.395 | 916.428 | 17.618 | 10.965 | 13.328 | 8.736 | 10.026 | 8.832 |
| Cook County | 959.989 | 973.317 | 965.452 | 1.075.015 | 1.062.605 | 1.022.048 | 11.237 | 8.873 | 9.840 | 7.144 | 7.839 | 6.867 |
| Total | 2.204.218 | 2.199.006 | 2.168.248 | 2.014.589 | 1.974.000 | 1.938.476 | 28.855 | 19.838 | 23.168 | 15.880 | 17.865 | 15.699 |

### WRITE-IN VOTES FOR TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

| County | Write-In Votes | County | Write-In Votes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bureau | 3 | Kane | 79 |
| Champaign | 25 | Knox | 30 |
| Cook | 254 | Madison | 18 |
| Cumberland | 3 | Peoria | 7 |
| DeKalb | 6 | Sangamon | 6 |
| Iroquois | 12 | Will | 18 |
| Jasper | 6 | Winnebago | 66 |

TOTAL 533

SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED

OCT 24 1975

No. 75-474

In the

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL L. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN LUNDING, JR., and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*Respondents.*

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

HOWARD EGLIT
LANCE HADDIX
DAVID GOLDBERGER
ROGER BALDWIN FOUNDATION OF ACLU
5 South Wabash Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
312/726-6180

JOHN ABT
299 Broadway
New York, New York 10007
212/CO. 7-3110

MELVIN WULF
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
22 E. 40th Street
New York, New York
212/725-1222

Attorneys for Respondents

# INDEX


PAGE

Question Presented ..... 1

Statement of the Case ..... 2-3

Reasons for Denying the Writ ..... 3-7

Conclusion ..... 8


## Table Of Authorities


Cases

Baird v. Davoren, 346 F. Supp. 515 (D. Mass. 1972) 7

Carrington v. Rash, 380 U.S. 89 (1965) ..... 6

Communist Party v. Ogilvie, 357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972) ..... 2, 4

Dunn v. Blumstein, 405 U.S. 330 (1971) ..... 6

Gray v. Sanders, 372 U.S. 368 (1962) ..... 3, 4

Moore v. Ogilvie, 394 U.S. 814 (1969) .....1, 3, 4, 6, 7

Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party, 400 U.S. 806 (1970) ..... 3

Socialist Labor Party v. Gilligan, 406 U.S. 583 (1972) ..... 7

Socialist Workers Party v. Hare, 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969) ..... 7

Socialist Labor Party v. Rhodes, 318 F. Supp. 1262 (S.D. Ohio 1970), app. dismissed on other grounds sub nom. Socialist Labor Party v. Gilligan, 406 U.S. 583 (1972) ..... 7

Socialist Workers Party v. Rockefeller, 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y. 1970), aff'd Rockefeller v. Socialist Workers Party, 400 U.S. 806 (1970) ..... 3

Williams v. Rhodes, 393 U.S. 23 (1969) ..... 5

Zautra v. Miller, 348 F. Supp. 847 (D. Utah 1972) .. 7

Statutes

Ill. Rev. Stat., Chap. 46, §10-2 .....2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Ill. Rev. Stat., Chap. 46, §10-3 ..... 7

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1975

---

## *No. 75-474*

---

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, and MICHAEL L. LAVELLE, DONALD W. ADAMS, FRANKLIN LUNDING, JR., and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, individually and as members of the State Board of Elections,

*Petitioners,*

*vs.*

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ILLINOIS, ISHMAEL FLORY, LORRAINE ASHBY, JOHN LUMPKIN, JAY SCHAFFNER, VALERIE WITZKOWSKI; and THEODORE PEARSON, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

*Respondents.*

---

## BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

### QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether *Moore* v. *Ogilvie,* 394 U.S. 814, is dispositive of the unconstitutionality, for violation of the "one man, one vote" principle, of a state election law which requires nominating petitions of "new" party candidates for statewide office to be signed by 25,000 voters, of whom not more than 13,000 from the same county may be counted.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioners—Communist Party of Illinois, an unincorporated association, its candidates, and a voter wishing to vote for them—sought to nominate candidates for statewide offices in 1972, and again in the 1974 elections out of which this controversy arose. In both years, it was required by section 10-2 of the Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stat., Ch. 46, to secure petition signatures to qualify for the placement of its candidates on the ballot. This requirement flowed from the fact that it was a "new" political party as defined by section 10-2, having failed to secure at least 5% of the vote in the preceding election.

In 1974, the Party secured approximately 30,000 signatures, well in excess of the 25,000 required by section 10-2. But that section further provides that not more than 13,000 signatures from any one county will be counted. Respondents therefore ignored all of the Party's Cook County signatures in excess of 13,000 and denied it and its candidates a place on the ballot for failure to meet the multi-county signature requirement.

When confronted with a like rejection of its nominating petitions in 1972, the Party sought and obtained an order from a three-judge district court declaring section 10-2 unconstitutional for violation of the "one man, one vote" principle and granting a preliminary injunction against its enforcement. *Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie*, 357 F. Supp. 105 (N.D. Ill. 1972); Pet. Br., p. C1. The State did not appeal this decision.

Following rejection of the Party's 1974 petition, respondents again sought and obtained injunctive and de-

claratory relief. The Court of Appeals affirmed, concluding with the District Court that section 10-2 violates the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

## REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

Certiorari should be denied because the decision below is in accord with controlling decisions of this Court invalidating statutory schemes which disqualify voters from participating in the process of nominating by petition minor party or independent candidates for state-wide office solely because of the county of their residence within the state. *Moore* v. *Ogilvie, supra* (1969); *Rockefeller* v. *Socialist Workers Party,* 400 U.S. 806 (1970), aff'ing *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Rockefeller,* 314 F. Supp. 984 (S.D. N.Y. 1970). These decisions, in turn, simply represent the application to the nominating process for such candidates of the "one man, one vote" requirement which *Gray* v. *Sanders,* 372 U.S. 368 (1962) applied to primaries for the nomination of major party candidates.

Petitioners do not ask for reconsideration of the rule of *Moore* and *Rockefeller*. They argue (Pet. Br., p. 12) only that the statutes there involved are distinguishable from section 10-2. That argument was considered and laid to rest by the Court of Appeals. As its opinion states (Pet. Br., pp. A8-A9):

> "Section 10-2 suffers the same constitutional defect (as its predecessor did in *Moore, supra*). To paraphrase the Supreme Court in *Moore*: Under section 10-2 the entire electorate of Cook County, which represents 45% of all registered voters in Illinois, may not form a new political party and place its candidates on the ballot. Yet any 25,000 of the remaining 55% of registered voters properly distributed among the

> remaining 101 counties may form a new party to elect candidates to office. Put another way, the approximately 2,750,000 registered Illinois voters in urbanized Cook County do not have the power under section 10-2 to create a statewide political party to protect their own peculiar interests, while 25,000 voters in any two or more counties in rural downstate Illinois may create such a party to protect their distinctly different, and often competing interests. This two-county requirement, like the fifty county requirement in *Moore*, "discriminates against the residents of the populous counties of the state in favor of rural sections."

Indeed, it appears that in 1972 the State acquiesced in the conclusion that section 10-2 is unconstitutional under *Moore*. For it did not appeal the three-judge court decision in *Communist Party* v. *Ogilvie, supra*, which so held. Its belated change of heart is not warranted by decisions of this or any other court.

In holding the "one man, one vote" principle applicable to party primaries, *Gray* v. *Sanders, supra*, at 379, made it clear that in every aspect of the electoral process:

> once the geographical unit for which a representative is to be chosen is designated (and here that unit is the state, for the offices at issue are statewide ones), all who participate in the election are to have an equal vote—whatever their race, whatever their sex, whatever their income, and wherever their home may be in the geographical unit. This is required by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Under *Gray*, the Court would obviously not countenance a primary law which denied nomination to the state-wide candidate who received a majority of the votes cast, when more than 52% of his votes came from one county. No

more will it countenance section 10-2, which applies a like formula (13,000 signatures, which equals 52% of the requisite 25,000) to the nominating petitions of minor party candidates.

The hard statistical facts are that section 10-2 makes residence the critical criterion in determining whether a voter shall be given a voice in nominating "new" party candidates. One million voters in Cook County or 100,000 in Lake County (which has no major urban area) could sign the petition of the candidate whom they see as the man for the times and for the state. But only 13,000 of these signatures would be counted, the remainder being treated as non-existent. These voters would be dependent upon the voters of at least one other county to supply the 12,000 deficiency, or their man would be denied a place on the ballot.

There can be no compelling state interest (*Williams* v. *Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23, 31 (1969)) in this crass violation of equal protection, and petitioners point to none. They attempt to justify section 10-2 on two grounds.

First, they offer the hypothetical danger (Pet. Br., p. 16) that "Without some regulation, Chicago fringe candidates would have the power to flood the statewide ballot in every election." Their hypothesis is at odds with the facts. For three million suburban voters reside in Cook County with interests often at odds with those of Chicago residents. They, too—and not just Chicagoans—are denied an equal voice in the nominating process, as are the residents of every other county. Moreover, even if it could be shown that candidates selected by Cook County voters act adversely to the interests of downstate residents (a showing totally unsupported by petitioners), that showing could not by any stretch justify the denial

to such voters of an equal voice in the nominating process. "'Fencing out' from the franchise a sector of the population because of the way they vote is constitutionally impermissible." *Carrington* v. *Rash,* 380 U.S. 89, 94 (1965). Accord, *Dunn* v. *Blumstein,* 405 U.S. 330, 355-56 (1971).

Second, petitioners argue (Pet. Br., p. 8) that section 10-2 is needed "to screen out the frivolous and nuisance candidacies." But section 10-2 was designed in a manner that "screens out" candidates whose massive support, although confined to a single county, refutes any such characterization. Moreover, as the Court of Appeals observed (Pet. Br., p. A11), if there is a compelling state interest in avoiding "laundry list" ballots, "some method is surely available which will serve the interest without making the effectiveness of an Illinois citizen's electoral power depend on his geographical location within that state." Obviously, section 10-2 is "insufficiently 'tailored' to achieve the articulated state goal." *Dunn* v. *Blumstein, supra,* at 357.[1]

Petitioners' contention that *Moore* is not dispositive of the unconstitutionality of section 10-2 in its present form has been rejected by a three-judge court, a single judge district court and the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. As appears from what has been said here, their

[1] Petitioners assert (Pet. Br., p. 14) that "there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record that the signature distribution requirement has prevented a legitimate, new statewide political party from obtaining ballot position . . ." This assertion is contrary to fact. In both 1972 and 1974 the Communist Party obtained well over 25,000 signatures but had its petitions rejected by the state authorities because of its inability to satisfy the multi-county signature requirement. In consequence, it would not have appeared on the ballot in either year but for the intervention of the district court.

conclusion is unassailable. Other federal courts have examined a variety of similar statutes and invalidated them on the basis of *Moore*.[2] Accordingly, there is no occasion for review by the Court.

---

[2] *Socialist Workers Party* v. *Hare*, 304 F. Supp. 534 (E.D. Mich. 1969); *Baird* v. *Davoren*, 346 F. Supp. 515 (D. Mass. 1972); *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Rhodes*, 318 F. Supp. 1262 (S.D. Ohio 1970), appeal dismissed on other grnds. sub nom *Socialist Labor Party* v. *Gilligan*, 406 U.S. 583 (1972). Petitioners' reliance (Pet. Br., pp. 18-20) on *Zautra* v. *Miller*, 348 F. Supp. 847 (D. Utah 1972) is misplaced for three reasons: 1) The court erroneously employed the rational basis rather than the compelling state interest test. 2) The court held Utah's multi-county signature requirement (500 with 10 from each of 10 counties) *de minimis*, particularly in the light of plaintiffs' admission that they could have complied with it. 3) As the court found, Utah offers an alternative route to the ballot by independent petitions which require only 300 signatures with no geographical distribution. In Illinois, on the contrary, the signature and multi-county requirements for independent petitions are identical with those for "new" parties. Illinois Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stat., Ch. 46, section 10-3.

## CONCLUSION

Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard Eglit
Lance Haddix
David Goldberger
Roger Baldwin Foundation of ACLU
5 South Wabash Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
312/726-6180

John Abt
299 Broadway
New York, New York 10007
212/CO. 7-3110

Melvin Wulf
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
22 E. 40th Street
New York, New York
212/725-1222

*Attorneys for Respondents*